

SANZENBACHER, CAROLYN K., M.A., *Early Christian Teachings on Jews: A Necessary Cause of the Antisemitism that Informed the Holocaust*. (2010)
Directed by Dr. Karl A. Schleunes, 215 pp.

The idea that Christianity was related to the antisemitism that informed the Holocaust was widely resisted in the early years following WW II discovery of Nazi exterminations of Jews. Yet before the end of the Holocaust century the major bodies of Christianity had labeled traditional Christian attitudes toward Jews as the fuel for “fires of hatred,” declared the Church “sinful and in need of conversion,” and called for the Church to “submit her own history to critical examination.” By the turn of the millennium, formal confessions had not only been made throughout western Christendom for atrocities perpetrated against Jews historically but also for what was said to be a necessary causal relation between Christian teachings and the Nazi antisemitism that informed the Holocaust. In light of these admissions, and the growing scholarly consensus that it is no longer tenable to claim that Christian teachings on Jews are unrelated to the Holocaust, this study traces a triad of foundational teachings embodying the doctrines of Christian dominion, Jewish subservience, and perpetual Jewish suffering from their inception through the Third Reich. Not only were these teachings, along with their attendant ideas, terms, and concepts, the single most important weapon-group in early Christianity’s supersessionist arsenal, they were the means by which clusters of mutually dependent ideas about Jews were sealed with divine authority and delivered to modern western culture. The history of this complex development not only helps us to understand how ancient Christian theological claims became modern secular weapons to use against Jews in the twentieth century, it explains how the former can justly be called a necessary cause of the Holocaust some nineteen hundred years later.

EARLY CHRISTIAN TEACHINGS ON JEWS:
A NECESSARY CAUSE OF THE
ANTISEMITISM THAT
INFORMED THE
HOLOCAUST

by

Carolyn K Sanzenbacher

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
2010

Approved by

Committee Chair

© 2010 Carolyn K. Sanzenbacher

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____
Karl A. Schleunes

Committee Members _____
Marc Bregman

Steven Ruzicka

Date of Acceptance by Committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this study has been encouraged over many years by Dr. Karl A. Schleunes, who has spent untold hours reading and commenting on my work. This project has also been encouraged in stages by a UNCG Undergraduate Research Assistantship under Dr. Schleunes, the Roger Schwirck Award for Excellence in Philosophy, and the Josephine Hege Phi Beta Kappa Award. These deeply appreciated acknowledgements have not only provided supporting funds for research and study in Switzerland, Poland, and Germany, they have also served as cherished reminders of my responsibility to the ideals of excellence invested in those awards. I am indebted to Dr. Gary Rosenkrantz for his invaluable critiques and critical insights, Dr. Joshua Hoffman for an indelible impression of the importance of analysis, Dr. Robert Rosthal for years of insightful discussions on the power of ideas, and Dr. Cheryl Junk for unfailing and long-term support. I am particularly beholden to the post-Holocaust scholarship on which this work stands, and especially grateful to those scholars who labored to collect and translate ancient and medieval primary source documents. My gratitude to the Interlibrary Loan Department of UNCG is immense. Not only did the staff willingly find obscure texts, microfilm, and collections of primary sources, they patiently arranged for me to work through extensive but borrowing-restricted archives, five microfiche at a time, over the course of several years. I would also like to recognize the archivists at both the World Council of Churches Library in Geneva, Switzerland and Special Collections at the Yale Divinity Library, who went out of their way to meet my every need during periods of work at their remarkable institutions. It is my great honor to thank Dr. Marc Bregman and Dr. Steven Ruzicka, who generously gave of their time to serve on my Thesis Committee. My greatest debt remains with my Committee Chairman, Dr. Karl Schleunes, whose inspiration, scholarly excellence, historical acumen, and kindness are unsurpassed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION: BEFORE THE END OF THE HOLOCAUST CENTURY.....	1
II. THE HIDDEN MEANINGS: A THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN DOMINION AND PERPETUAL JEWISH SUFFERING.....	10
III. THE MAKING OF GOD’S ENEMY: A CHRIST-KILLING PROTOTYPE	45
IV. A MODERN CONVOLUTION: THREAT OF THE JUDAIZING ACCURSED TO ESTABLISHED DOMINION	89
V. THE NAZI SOLUTION: DOMINION AND DEJUDAIZATION	126
VI. CONCLUSION: THE SILENCE OF NON-INTERFERENCE	170
BIBLIOGRAPHY	190

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Allegorical Christianization of Hebrew Scriptures in <i>Epistle of Barnabas</i>	20
Figure 2. Perpetual Jewish Servitude as Divine Punishment: Papal Teachings, 1198-1268	32
Figure 3. Perpetual Servitude / Do Not Slay: Papal Teachings, 1198-1268	40
Figure 4. Divine Desolation of Jews: Chapter Descriptions, Douay-Rheims Bible, 1610	98
Figure 5. The Racial Foundation Continuum in <i>Mein Kampf</i>	134
Figure 6. Major <i>Judentum</i> Research Institutes in Germany, 1935-1945	146
Figure 7. <i>Judentum</i> Research Institutes, 1935-1945, Occupied Countries	158

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION:
BEFORE THE END OF THE HOLOCAUST CENTURY

The idea that Christianity was in any way related to the antisemitism that informed the Holocaust was widely resisted in the early years following WWII discovery of Nazi exterminations of Jews. Christian apologies issued forth from the arms of the Church, both Catholic and Protestant, in efforts to distinguish the antiJudaic attitude of Christianity from Nazi racial ideology. Statements condemning antisemitism called attention to its unChristian nature and godless irreconcilability to Christianity, while stressing that the Church had always judged harshly all forms of injustice and hatred. Admission of antiJewish attitudes in ancient Christian writings was tempered by the Catholic claim that such would have been the attitudes of individuals and not the official position of Christianity. Catholic apologists, in particular, went to great lengths to distinguish between official positions of the Church and those of individuals, insisting that antiJewish teachings were the distortions, misunderstandings, and misinterpretations of unofficial minority traditions. Coextensive with such apologies was a series of European Protestant admissions which reinforced the idea that individual expression of antiJewish attitudes in no way reflected fault with Christian doctrine. While openly confessing that many had fallen prey to antisemitism under Nazi rule, it was with the understanding that such ‘poison’ had infiltrated and weakened Christians and local churches from without. The Church itself, in both apologies and admissions, was portrayed as the divinely established institution of Christianity, resting on a holy foundation and irrefutably distanced from the antisemitic ideology that underwrote the state sanctioned murder of six million Jews.

Yet before the end of the Holocaust century the major bodies of Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant, had labeled traditional Christian attitudes toward Jews as the fuel for “fires of hatred,” declared the Church “sinful and in need of conversion,” and called for the Church to “submit her own history to critical examination.”¹ By the turn of the millennium formal confessions had been made throughout western Christendom for atrocities perpetrated against Jews historically, as well as for remaining silent in the face of Nazism antisemitism, and for what was said to be a *necessary* causal relation between Christian teachings and the Nazi antisemitism that informed the Holocaust.² In the case of this latter confession, while continuing to distinguish between Christian antiJudaism and Nazi racial antisemitism, the United States National Conference of Catholic Bishops openly admitted in February 2001 that Christian teachings, beginning as early as the second century, were *necessarily* instrumental in the development of Nazi antisemitism.³

Such admission can be understood as acknowledgment of at least two kinds of causal relations. The lesser of the two, and one admitted by other major bodies of Christendom as well, has more to do with preparing Europe for the acceptance and success of Nazi antisemitism than with its actual development. In this less encompassing sense Christianized Europe is seen as having been so permeated with negative Christian images of Jews that consciences were lulled and resistance to Nazism was weakened. The second and stronger admission, however, posits that

¹ Presbyterian Church (USA), General Assembly, 1987, “A Theological Understanding of the Relationship between Christians and Jews;” Bishops of Germany, 1995, “Opportunity to Re-examine Relationships with the Jews,” 1995; Bishops of France, 1997, “Declaration of Repentance of Drancy.”

² United States National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Catholic Teaching on the Shoah: Implementing the Holy See’s We Remember* (February 2001). The document was approved by the Bishops Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations (November 1999), and the Administrative Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (September 2000).

³ Ibid., “One way to put the ‘connectedness’ between the Christian teaching of anti-Judaism...and Nazi antisemitism is that the former is a ‘necessary cause’ to consider in explaining the development and success of the latter in the twentieth century - but not a ‘sufficient cause.’ ”

Christian teachings on Jews, beginning in the second century, became a necessary cause in the actual development of Nazi antisemitism. While this is not the same as saying that Christian teachings on Jews are the only cause, or that such teachings necessitated the development of Nazi antisemitism, it is to say that specific Christian teachings were a necessary condition of the Nazi antisemitism that did, in fact, develop.

This change in Christian position from claiming nothing in common with Nazi antisemitism to one of admitting that Christian teachings were a necessary cause was an act of unprecedented purgation in the history of Christian-Jewish relations. Christianity did not move in a unified body, however, nor did it move in a straight line from a position of unawareness and denial to one of insight, confession, and correction. Coming to terms with deeply ingrained negative teachings on Jews required also coming to terms with how deeply ingrained was the Christian view that such teachings were not negative. Awareness, recognition, confrontation, and acceptance of the idea that the bearer of universal love was also bearer of a cause of the hatred that had nearly extinguished European Jewry came about reluctantly, piecemeal, and slowly, and not without scholarly provocation.⁴ Thoughts and actions previously viewed as divinely ordained, either specifically or in principle, began to appear indefensible in the light of scholarship: long-standing biblical interpretations, prayers, sermons, commentaries, liturgical and education materials, canon and civil laws, papal bulls, forced sermons, forced conversions, forced ghettos, forced identifying badges and clothing, acquisition of Jewish goods and property.

⁴ Most notably, James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, 1934; Joshua Tractenberg, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Antisemitism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943); James Seaver, *The Jews in the Roman Empire: From Constantine to Theodosius II* (1946 Dissertation, Cornell University, published 1952); Jules Isaac, *Jesus et Israel* (Paris, 1948, English translation, 1971) and *The Teaching of Contempt, Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism* (Paris, 1962; English translation, 1964); Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIth Century*, Revised Edition (New York: Hermon Press, 1966); Rosemary Reuther, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (Minneapolis: Seabury Press, 1974); Franklin Littell, *The Crucifixion of the Jews*, (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1975); Leon Poliakov, *The History of Anti-Semitism*, Vol. I, (Vanguard Press, 1975); Charlotte Klein, *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

At the same time, in both specific and general studies, scholars were grappling with the problems of historical continuity and how to speak of and define this ‘traditional Christian Jew hatred’ - or, as apologists and others termed it, Christian antiJudaism - in relation to Nazi antisemitism. With ardently debated variations a massive literature developed along two broad lines. On one side of the divide were those who argued for continuity between the Nazi and ancient-medieval versions of Jew hatred, while on the other were those, including Christian apologists, who held on various grounds that Nazi antisemitism was something altogether different.⁵ Of those arguments for discontinuity, the most persuasive held that 1), the Nazi intent to extinguish and the execution of extinguishing actions had no precedents in Jewish history, 2), that the biological racial aspect of Nazi antisemitism separated it from all ancient and medieval Jew hatreds, and 3), that Nazism was wholly secular while Christian Jew hatred was religiously based. A second major factor advancing the idea of discontinuity was the word ‘antisemitism’ itself, which was not coined until the late nineteenth century and was used initially as a term describing organized political action against Jews.⁶ As these points continued to be argued vigorously, scholarship’s focus leaned in the direction of perceiving antisemitism as the racial and non-religious manifestation of antisemitic actions. The resulting literature over the first half century is rich in attempts to define antisemitism according to instantiations, such as religious, economic, political, literary, racial, psychological, to describe its characteristics and lines of

⁵ For discussions on the continuity problem in two different decades see Shulamit Volkov’s 1978 “Antisemitism as a Cultural Code: Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXII* (1978), 25-46, and Donald Niewyk’s 1990 “Solving the ‘Jewish Problem’: Continuity and change in German Antisemitism, 1871-1945,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXXV* (1990), 335-370.

⁶ The problem of how to speak of the relation between Nazi antisemitism and ancient Christian attitudes toward Jews without anachronistically using the modern term challenged scholars on both sides of the continuity divide. For discussion of this problem, see David Berger, ed., *History and Hate: The Dimensions of Anti-Semitism* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1986), especially Shaye J.D. Cohen, “Anti-Semitism in Antiquity: The Problem of Definition,” 43-48, and Robert Chazan, “Medieval Anti-Semitism,” 49-66.

demarcation, and to explain how it differs from Christian antiJudaism, particularly in terms of its manifestations of hostility and extermination.

Shifts away from this focus began to appear in the fourth post-Holocaust decade, one of the most significant of which is Peter Pulzer's 1988 revised edition of his 1964 classic, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*. Here, Pulzer is "more strongly convinced than when [he] wrote the book that a tradition of religiously inspired Jew hatred...was a necessary condition for the success of antisemitic propaganda, even when [it was] expressed in non-religious terms and absorbed by those no longer religiously observant." In making this revision he was not only among the first, if not the first, to cross the divide and posit Christian ideas as a necessary condition of Nazi antisemitism, he was among those who first weakened the bulwark of continuity by narrowing the alleged division between Christian and secular versions of Jew hatred. After Alex Bein's 1990 *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*, which exhaustively demonstrated that "past times live on in all kinds of forms," and Robert Wistrich's 1991 *Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred*, which argued convincingly that antisemitism is a single phenomenon with multiple metamorphoses, one finds more distinctions in the literature between the 'old' Christian and the 'new' modern antisemitism. Of those who saw links between the 'old' and 'new,' Doris Bergen's 1996 *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* argued forcefully that Nazi antisemitism had "built on and perpetuated existing tendencies in European Christianity," and that its racial aspects had not replaced "old religious hatreds" but had simply "added new layers."⁷

⁷ Peter Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*, Revised Edition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), 9; Amos Funkenstein, "Theological Interpretations of the Holocaust," *Unanswered Questions: Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews*, ed. Francois Furet (New York: Schocken Books, 1989), 275-303; Alex Bein, *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem* (New York: Herzl Press, 1990), 13; Robert S. Wistrich, *Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1991); Doris L. Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996). Bergen argued in "Religion and the Holocaust: Some Reflections," 41-65, in *Lessons and Legacies*, Vol. IV, ed. and Introduction,

As scholarship was emerging from its protracted period of emphasis on implementation of the Holocaust at the turn of the millennium, the staid categories of antisemitism according to instantiations were yielding to categorizations of ideological causation, such as Paul Lawrence Rose's 1990 "destructionist antisemitism," Daniel Goldhagen's 1996 "eliminationist antisemitism," and Saul Friedlaender's 1997 "redemptive antisemitism."⁸ Along with this renewed emphasis on the ideological body of ideas in Nazi antisemitism was the increasing understanding that the Holocaust had multiple causes and antisemitism had multiple forms. New research and analyses, as well, were underscoring the point that Christian ideas about Jews had more in common with Nazism antisemitic ideology than had been previously recognized. From John Roth's assertion that Christianity was "a necessary condition" of the Holocaust (2000), to Yehuda Bauer's "well-worn truth that Nazi ideology owes its image of the Jew to Christian antisemitism" (2001), to Richard Stegmann-Gall's refutation that Nazism was unrelated to Christianity (2003), to Susannah Heschel's exhaustive study of the German Christian use of Christian theology (2008), scholars were making it clear that it was no longer tenable to claim that Christian teachings are unrelated to the Holocaust.⁹

Larry V. Thompson (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2003). Bergen argues that while "Christian antisemitism" was not a sufficient cause, it "helped make [Nazi] commands comprehensible to the rank and file who carried out measures against Jews." See also the important work of Claudia Koonz, *The Nazi Conscience* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap of Harvard University Press, 2003).

⁸Paul Lawrence Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996); Saul Friedlaender, *Nazi Germany and the Jews* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1997). See also Gavin Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism and History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990); the critical work of Steven Katz, *The Holocaust in Historical Context, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); and John Weiss, *Ideology of Death: Why the Holocaust Happened in Germany* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996).;

⁹ John K. Roth, "What Does the Holocaust have to do with Christianity?," 5-10, *The Holocaust and the Christian World: Reflections on the Past, Challenges for the Future*, eds. Carol Rittner, Stephen D. Smith, Irena Steinfeldt (New York: Continuum, 2000); Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001); and Richard Stegmann-Gall, *The Holy Reich: Nazi Conceptions of*

What we have today is a rich and growing literature of both specific and general studies from multiple disciplines that, taken as a whole, greatly diminishes the hold of the continuity problem but does not erase it for responsible scholarship.¹⁰ Neither is the continuity problem eased by the long line of Catholic and Protestant official admissions that implicate Christian teachings as a cause of the Holocaust. Because western civilization is built on the foundations of Christian thought, and because the structures of Christian thought included key antithetical claims about Jews during the centuries of western civilization formation, we of post-Holocaust western culture and society have inherited those deeply-embedded structures of thought that are now said to be a cause of the Holocaust. Not only are we faced with the task of understanding these Christian admissions, we are faced with the remains of the structures of thought themselves, as well as the responsibility to explain how they are necessarily related to the Nazi industrialized murder of six million Jews.

In this context, and with awareness of the sensitivities surrounding such explanation, this study seeks to trace a triad of foundational Christian teachings from their inception in the second century to their Nazi incorporation and usage in the twentieth. While the point of departure for

Christianity, 1919-1945 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

¹⁰See, for example, Walter Z. Bachrach, *Anti-Jewish prejudices in German-Catholic Sermons* (UK: Edwin Mellen Press, 1993); Moshe Y. Herczl, *Christianity and the Holocaust of Hungarian Jewry* (New York: New York University Press, 1993); William Nicholls, *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc., 1993); Ronald Modras, *The Catholic Church and Antisemitism: Poland, 1933-1939* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994); Miriam S. Taylor, *AntiJudaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus* (New York: E.J.Brill, 1995); Michael Phayer, *The Catholic Church and the Holocaust, 1930-1965* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University press, 2000); James Carroll, *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jew* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2001); Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *A Moral Reckoning: The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002); Suzanne Brown-Fleming, *The Holocaust and Catholic Conscience: Cardinal Aloisius Muench and the Guilt Question in Germany* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2006); Magda Teter, *Jews and Heretics in Catholic Poland: A Beleaguered Church in the Post-Reformation Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Robert Michael, *Holy Hatred: Christianity, Antisemitism, and the Holocaust* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

study of Christian teachings on Jews is generally the New Testament trial and crucifixion of Jesus, this study focuses on the stretching, elaboration, and additions to the ideas that stemmed from those accounts. From the early second century, and with increasing authority, Christians were taught to read divinely ‘hidden truths’ in the Hebrew scriptures through allegorical and typological interpretative methods, with the understanding that they had been providentially hidden and preserved by God for those who would supersede Jews and Judaism. At the center of these hidden prophetic meanings, each of which became part of a mounting argument that Christianity is the divine heir to everything once promised to Israel, was the negation of God’s covenant with Jews and the awarding of the covenant to Christians. With this unquestioned understanding about divine entitlement to both the covenant and the Hebrew scriptures, ‘hidden truths’ were found, interpreted, and used from the Jews’ own scriptures to construct a theology of Christian dominance, Jewish subservience, and perpetual Jewish suffering, all of which were said to be divine consequences of the alleged Jewish crucifixion of Christ. That Jews are the archetypal enemies of God, Christ, Christians, and Christianity was part of this, as was the precept that Jews would ensue in a state of divinely imposed suffering under Christian dominion until they returned to God through conversion to the ‘true’ religion. Because these theological beliefs were necessary components of early Christianity’s self-understanding of its reason for existence, as well as tenets of apologetic and proselytizing arguments to others, they were boldly predicated as divine scriptural truths wherever the seeds of Christianity were spread. How Jews were to be thought of and how they were to be treated in society constituted attendant, and mutually interdependent, predications.

Of equal concern are the perdurable negative ideas, concepts, terms, pejorative names, and images borne from these fundamental and attendant teachings, sealed with divine authority, and delivered to modern western culture. What has been found, and what I attempt to relate, are

units of ideas rolled, coiled, and folded upon original Christian concepts as they make their way through time. Rather than spawning new descendents of ancestral concepts, as in an evolution of thought, the ideas under study retain all of their ancient parts, as in a *thickening* convolution, as they acquire more and more historical layers. Indeed, this holds true even as the ideas are packed into a coterie of pejorative names and terms, which themselves become expositions on the character, behavior, and intentions of Jews.

Because this work is concerned with words actually said, contexts in which they were said, and the speaker's authority within Christianity, I have relied almost exclusively on primary source documents of the early and medieval Church in the first half of the study. This is not to say that secondary sources have been ignored or slighted, but that I have conducted new analyses of treatises, books, sermons, bulls, histories, songs, prayers, commentaries, liturgies, laws, canons, stories, morality books, plays, and poetry, written by priests, bishops, monks, popes, church councils, church historians, Christian emperors, saints, and Doctors of the Church. Being cognizant of the difficulties involved in tracking and understanding words and concepts with multiple senses used by multiple writers at multiple junctures, I have emphasized the historical emergence, turning points, and subsequent effectuation of the ideas contained in these writings while structuring explanations around lexical, stipulative, and, in some cases, analytic definitions to serve as markers through the historical terrain. Rigorous documentation will hopefully open a window of understanding on the degree of consistency and persistency with which the teaching arm of the Church used its authoritative power to dispense ideas about Jews as divine truths. The developing history of the traced teachings, ideas, and terminology in the second half of the study will help us to understand not only how these ancient theological claims became modern weapons of Jewish extermination in the twentieth century, but how the former can justly be called a necessary cause of the latter some nineteen hundred years later.

CHAPTER II
THE HIDDEN MEANINGS:
A THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN DOMINION AND PERPETUAL JEWISH SUFFERING

One of the problems facing the early church fathers was proving the claim that all of the events surrounding the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus were prophesied in the Hebrew scriptures.¹ All such heralded events - that Jesus would be sent by God to redeem the world and die a brutal death at the hands of Jews, that God's covenant with Jews would be broken, that Christians would inherit the covenant and become the new chosen people of God, that Jerusalem would be destroyed, that God would abandon the Jews and set them wandering, that Jews would henceforth be in servitude to the followers of Christ, and that Jews would be eternally damned unless converted to the newly *chosen* - were allegedly prophesied in the 'misunderstood' texts of the 'old' Hebrew scriptures.² Proving the existence of those prophecies remained pivotal to justifying the Christian claim that God had replaced Judaism with Christianity. Proving the legitimacy of Christianity to supersede Judaism by proving that the claimed justifying events had been prophesized thus became the focus of early Christian argumentation about 'ownership' and meaning of the ancient Hebrew scriptures. Such arguments were inseparably tied to the fundamental Christian belief that sole possession of the 'whole truth' had been divinely placed in the hands of Christianity for "conversion and restoration of the human race."

¹ Ignatius, *Epistle to Phllipians*, VIII, pointed out in ca.108 that there were doubters who refused to believe the gospels unless it could be "proved" that Christ was in the ancient Hebrew scriptures.

² For a summary of supersessionist claims see chapter headings in Cyprian's *Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews*, I.1-24 and 2.14. See also Jacob Neusner, *Aphrahat and Judaism: The Christian-Jewish Argument in Fourth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 201-213, 234-242.

Claims of divine entitlement to the Hebrew texts were staked as early as ca.125 by Aristides of Athens, the first Christian apologist to treat the ‘old’ Hebrew scriptures and the ‘new’ revelations of the apostles as one category of unerring Christian truth. That Jews were removed from truth, that Christianity alone had possession of truth, and that “whatever is spoken in the mouth of Christians is of God” were fundamental Christian beliefs by this time, as was the tenet that the Hebrew scriptures contained the divine revelation of Christian truth.³ As justification for this set of beliefs the early fathers often cited a Jewish story about the third century b.c.e. Greek translation of the Torah, the first five books of the Hebrew bible. The original account, appearing in a work by a Hellenized Jew around 200 b.c.e., told of the Hebrew laws being translated into Greek at the request of the ruler of Egypt, Ptolemy II (285-247 b.c.e). Seventy-two elders from the twelve tribes of Israel were said to have been sent from Palestine to Alexandria and to have subsequently worked together for seventy-two days, comparing translations under the direction of an official of the Alexandrian library. When the story was told two hundred years later by a Hellenized Jewish philosopher living in first century c.e. Alexandria, the Jewish translators were said to have been “possessed,” as if under divine inspiration, translating “the same word for word, as though [each were] dictated to by an invisible prompter.” A third version written near the end of the same century by a Jewish historian dismissed the miraculous aspect of the middle version and more or less retold the original story.⁴

Under the pens of the Christian fathers, however, the centuries-old story became an embellished tale about the divine translation of the whole collection of ancient Hebrew scriptures

³ Aristides, *Apology* XIV-XVII, claims that Christian doctrine is the “gateway of light,” that supplications of Christians cause the earth to abide, and that Christians are “more blessed than all the men who are upon the face of the earth.” See also Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* XXXIX; *First Apology* XXIII; Pseudo-Justin, *Horatory Address to the Greeks* XIII; Irenaeus, *Ag. Heresies* 4.26.1; Tertullian, *Prescriptions* III; Cyprian, *Testimonies* 4,5; Athanasius, *To Marcellinus* 21.

⁴ The first account appears in *Letter of Aristeas*; the second in Philo, *On the Life of Moses*, II.VI.31-VII.43; the third in Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* XII.

for the benefit of Christianity.⁵ The Christianized versions of this story about the Greek Septuagint focused on the alleged miraculous nature of the translation, with most claiming that each of the seventy two translators worked in solitude and still produced the same “word for word” translation.⁶ The matching preciseness of each individual translation was so remarkable, Bishop Irenaeus explained in ca.185, that even the non-Jewish Egyptians “perceived that the Scriptures had been interpreted by the inspiration of God.” By the fourth century, an even more embellished version by Bishop Ehipanios of Salamis offered a list of the translators’ names, claiming they were divided into thirty six pairs, working and sleeping in thirty six small cells.⁷ The belief that the Greek translation of the entire Septuagint was “spoken” by the Holy Spirit was so common by the fifth century that Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria (412-444), later to be named Doctor of the Church, included it as one of *Ten Points of Doctrine* to be read to converts immediately before “delivering [them] over to the creed.”⁸ In 553 the Christian emperor Justinian even incorporated into Roman law that the inspired translators, “writing long before the saving revelation of our mighty Lord and Savior Jesus Christ,” carried out the translation as if they were illuminated by “prophetic grace.”⁹

⁵ For example, Justin Martyr, *Apology* I.XXXI; Pseudo Justin, *Horatory Address to the Greeks* XIII; Clement, *Stromateis* I.148-9; Irenaeus, *Heresies* 3.21; Tertullian, *Apology* 18, Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 8. The exhaustive study of Abraham and David J. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), discuss additional extant versions by Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria, Hilary of Poitiers, Pseudo Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Philastrius of Brescia, Jerome, Chrysostom, John Malalas, and Isadore of Seville.

⁶ Some versions cite 70 rather than 72 translators, for example, Pseudo Justin, *Horatory Address to the Greeks*, and Eusebius, *Chronicon* (cited in Wasserstein, p.109).

⁷ Irenaeus, *Heresies* 3.21.2 ; Ehipanios, *De Mensuris Ponderibus* 10, *The Armenian Texts of Epiphanius of Salamis*, trans. and edited by Michael E. Stone and Roberta R. Ervine (Louvain: Peeters, 2000), 92-96.

⁸ Cyril, *On Ten Points of Doctrine* 34.

⁹ Code of Justinian, Novella 146.I, 553 c.e.

This emphasis on the divinely inspired nature of the Greek translation was corollary to the belief that God had providentially ordained it for the ‘new people’ who were being prepared to supersede Jews and Judaism. The Septuagint was thus revered by the early church as a work of “Divine Providence” on behalf of Christianity,” made for the “benefit [of] gentiles who were destined to believe in Christ.”¹⁰ That the translation was imbued with accuracy was taken for granted.¹¹ Where differences existed with the Hebrew scriptures possessed by contemporary Jews, Jews were said to have tampered with, mutilated, or forged the scriptures.¹² And even though other Greek translations existed, most of the fathers, including Augustine, insisted that wherever differences between the Greek translations existed the divinely ordained ‘Christian version’ must be given authority. Indeed, he stressed in his late fourth and early fifth century letters to Jerome, who was translating the Hebrew scriptures into the Latin Vulgate, that the inspired translators of the Septuagint “could [not] have been mistaken.” The same view held sway in his highly influential *City of God*, where he taught that, even though others had translated the Hebrew scriptures into Greek, “the Church has accepted this Septuagint as if it were the only version.”¹³

Jews themselves served as a necessary though involuntary component of this winding and complex argument for Christian possession of the Hebrew scriptures. “Whenever we wish to

¹⁰ Pseudo-Justin, *Horatory Address to the Greeks*, XIII; Irenaeus, *Heresies* 4.26.1; Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.8; *Preparation for the Gospel* VIII; Augustine, *City of God* 18.42.

¹¹ See Paul Lamarch, “The Septuagint Bible of the Earliest Christians,” *The Bible in Christian Antiquity*, ed. and trans., Paul M. Blowers (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1997), who concludes that the Septuagint was a “consciously interpretative” rereading of the Hebrew Bible.

¹² Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* LXXI-LXXIII; Irenaeus, *Against All Heresies* 3.21.1; Origen, *Homily in Jeremiah* XVI.10; *Letter from Origen to Africanus* 2-5. The comment “this is one of the passages corrupted by the Jews since the crucifixion” is inserted as a footnote by translators of the 19th century Ante Nicene Fathers edition of Cyprian’s *Testimonies Against Jews*, II.20, ff 8.

¹³ Augustine to Jerome, 394; to Jerome, 403; Jerome to Augustine, 404; Augustine to Jerome, 405. Augustine, *City of God* 18.43; *On Christian Doctrine*, Book II, 15.

show Christ prophesied,” Augustine explained in the fifth century, “we produce documents from our [Jewish] enemies.” In this way, he taught, Jews have “become our librarians,” carrying our Christian books, “just as slaves behind their masters carry their documents.”¹⁴ That Jews did this librarian work to their confusion, as Augustine put it, was the fifth century version of the centuries-long argument that Jews never understood their own scriptures.¹⁵ While reasons for this alleged ‘Jewish blindness’ varied among the fathers and down the centuries - carnality, wickedness, God’s intention¹⁶ - it was commonly held that Jews were unable to access God’s word because they were blinded to the fact that the Hebrew texts were harbingers of Christian truth. The notion was of such Christian parlance that Emperor Justinian stated in that same 529 Roman law just mentioned that the Hebrew texts held “sacred prophecies which [we]re hidden from [Jews]”¹⁷

Talk of hidden meanings had been around for some hundreds of years before the inception of Christianity. The idea had surfaced in the sixth century Greek city-states in response to philosophical attacks against the alleged causal powers of gods in the Homeric myths. The onslaught of arguments against the gods were viewed by Homeric apologists as a direct attack against the authority of Homer and, rejecting the possibility that Homer had erred, the apologists began to search his myths for deeper meanings, claiming that ancient ‘wise men’ often preserved knowledge by way of coded myths and riddles. Where it appeared that Homer was telling stories about the improper behavior and in-fighting of the gods, the apologists argued he was actually

¹⁴ Ibid., *On Psalm 57.7* and *On Psalm 40*.

¹⁵ For an extended treatment of Jewish ‘blindness,’ see all 10 chapters of Augustine’s *In Answer to the Jews*.

¹⁶ *Barnabas* 8.7, 9.4, 10.12; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* IX, XIV, XXIX, XXX, XXXIV, LV; *First Apology* XXXVI; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.26.1; Tertullian, *Apology* 21; Cyprian, *Testimonies* 4, 5.

¹⁷ Code of Justinian, Preface, Novella 146. To curb the ‘problem’ of Jews reading the scriptures literally, Justinian ordered the Greek translation, preferably the “most accurate...and most highly approved” Septuagint, to be read in synagogues with the hope that listeners would “perceive their diviner meaning.”

setting down allegorical truths about the perpetual conflict of natural processes, such as earth, water, air, and fire.¹⁸ Homer's stories, in other words, were merely signposts to ancient truths that had been hidden at Homer's discretion for those in future generations who would find and herald his wisdom. The same held true for Hesiod and other Greek wise men, the apologists argued, and as heirs of knowledge from these authoritative sages it was incumbent upon them to uncover and pass along the coded meanings.¹⁹

This concept of preserved hidden meanings passed roughly from ancient Homeric apologists, philosophers, and Greek grammarians through various schools of Greek and Hellenistic philosophy to Philo of Alexandria,²⁰ the same Hellenized Jewish philosopher who

¹⁸ See Theagenes of Rhegion, Scholia B on Homer, Iliad 20.67 at Emory Classics (www.emory.edu/COLLEGE/CLASSICS/Resources98/myth04.html).

¹⁹ Paul Veyne, pp.59-70, importantly points out that the assumption behind all allegorical interpretation is the idea that the text under consideration is a "true authority." Assumptions concerning the authority of the author were often extended to those who found truths buried in the authoritative texts. When the Stoic Chrysippus extracted hidden truths from Hesiod and Homer, for instance, he claimed that the truths extracted were 'Stoic truths,' hence demonstrating that both Hesiod and Homer were actually Stoics before Stoicism existed. For more on the development of this idea from Greek antiquity to the early Church fathers, see G.R. Boys-Stones, *Post Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of its Development from the Stoics to Origen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). See also A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Gerald L. Bruns, *Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Peter Lautner, Review of Jens Holzhausen's *Psyche-Seele-Anima: Festschrift fuer Karini Alt zum 7.Mai 1998* (Leipzig, 1998); J.Tate, "Greek Allegory," *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Second Edition, 1992.

²⁰ Philo, who was later Christianized by the fathers, uses various words to speak of allegorical interpretation: *musterion* (mystery), *apokruphon* (secret), *noeton* (intelligible), *aphanes* (unseen), *arretion* (unexpressed). He held that the underlying meaning, *dianoia* or inner soul, best elucidated the truth of the literal scriptures, which he described as 'body.' In this sense, there is agreement with some of the methods of the temple scribes in Jerusalem, who viewed interpretation as an ongoing process involving four levels of meanings: literal, implied, homiletical, and mystical. For examples of Philo's method see *De Opificio Mundi* II, 7-8 and VII, 30-31, where air is analogous to the breath of God, and light, to the image of God. For analyses of Philo's influence on early Christian interpretative principles and methods, see Harry A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), esp. 30-35. See also Karlfried Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature, Vol.III Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Sec.III, Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature* (The Netherlands and Minneapolis: Van Corcum & Comp B.V. and Fortress Press, 1993); Thomas F. Torrance, *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1995), esp. chpt.1. See Photius, the ninth century Patriarch of Constantinople, who records that the early church adopted their allegorical

authored the middle version of the Septuagint legend and, from there, to the early Christian church. This is not to say that Greek allegorical methods of interpretation were adopted by the early fathers without amendment, but it is to say that both the idea and methods used to interpret the Hebrew scriptures in the early church derived from a tradition, not wholly scriptural, which emphasized the subordination of a literal text to its ‘higher’ underlying meaning. Yet neither the Greek grammarians, as apologists for Homer, nor Philo, as apologist for the truth of the Hebrew scriptures,²¹ nor the early fathers, who sought the ‘essence’ of Christian truth in those same scriptures, were finished with the literal meaning of scripture. Some passages were to be taken in a literal sense, some in both literal and allegorical senses, and some only allegorically, but many if not most were to be interpreted as having layers of meanings. Passages were to be judged by sets of criteria based on ‘worthiness,’ the idea being that those ‘unworthy’ of the author in question contained ‘hidden meanings.’ For the early fathers, this meant that acceptable readings of the Hebrew scriptures had to be reflective of the image of God, meaning *only* the orthodox Christian conception of the triune God.

While not all of the fathers agreed about how the ‘heavenly realities’ of Christianity were hidden - some said they were hidden in parables while others said allegories, types, or symbols, either figuratively or metaphorically - the belief that Christian truth lay buried in the Hebrew scriptures remained unquestioned. It was there in the “lowly and contemptible literal phrase,” said third century Origen, that “the hidden splendor of doctrines [was] concealed.” Differences between what *seemed* to be said and what was *really* said were viewed as “enigmas” and

interpretative methods from Philo, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 105. It must also be taken into account that most of the earliest Christian apologists were trained in philosophical schools that utilized variations of these interpretative methods.

²¹ There was a second line of allegorical interpretation among Temple scribes in Palestine by late first century bce to early first century ce, but this school was said to be less influenced by the allegorical philosophical tradition, such that interpretations remained closer to the literal meaning. See *Encyclopedia Judaica* for articles on Allegorical Interpretation, Biblical Exegesis, Midrash, and Kabbalah.

ambiguities” that only the enlightened by Christ could explain.²² This was not the same as saying that every Christian, by virtue of being a Christian, was enlightened enough to understand the scriptures without assistance. Truth was intended for the collective body of Christianity, and that which was assigned to the category of Christian truth was to be ‘found,’ agreed upon, and passed along by “those who possess[ed] the [apostolic] succession of the Church.” It was only by adhering to this ‘rule of truth,’ or ‘rule of faith,’ that authorized teachers could expound the scriptures to everyday Christians “without danger [of error].” Any teaching of the Hebrew scriptures outside these parameters of orthodox succession was viewed as heretical and presumptuous falsifications of divine texts to which none but the orthodox had legitimate possession.²³

Early methods for unlocking the hidden meanings derived from two primary schools of interpretative techniques, each of which was armed with a different presupposition about the historicity of the Hebrew texts. Interpretation of scripture at Alexandria, the earliest school, was guided by the belief that historical events in the ‘old’ scriptures were actually allegorical symbols pointing to higher metaphysical realities. This tendency to negate or subordinate the authenticity of historical events - or, as one twentieth century scholar phrased it, “turn the Old Testament into

²² For example, *Barnabas* 1.4-5 and 17.2; Irenaeus, *Ag. Heresies* 3.21.2 and 4.26.1; Origen, *F. Principles*, 4.1.7, 4.2.2, 4.2.6; Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* II, 7-8. See also Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 5.21.4, who attributed to ancients the work of delivering truth to future generations through symbols, allegories, and enigmas, and even went so far to say that all truths were hidden in enigmas. Justin Martyr claimed that it was prophesied that Christians would be delivered from error, *Dialogue* XXXIX. See also Irenaeus, *Ag. Heresies* 4.26.2-5, 33; Tertullian, *Ag. Heretics* 13; Clement, *Strom.* 7; Origen, *First. Principles* 4.2.3, 4.2.6. See Karlfried Froelich for the idea expressed in Paul’s writings that Christians receive the spiritual gift of recognizing ‘types’ in the Hebrew scriptures when they are baptized, 8-10.

²³ See Tertullian, *Against Heretics*, 29-38, for arguments that heretics have no right to the Hebrew scriptures, that they cannot claim succession from the apostles, and that they alter and mutilate the scriptures. For an example of how fiercely defended were these claims of possession, see Ambrose, *Letter* XL.16, for a 4th century description of the burning of a ‘heretical church’ by a group of monks who were enraged at the “insolence” of heretics singing the psalms as they walked to a festival. See especially Amnon Linder, *The Jews in the Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 476-477, for a 589 decree by the Council of Narbonne that prohibits even Jews from “sing[ing] psalms while [publicly] accompanying the dead.”

ancient mythology²⁴ - was later countered by the interpretative school in Antioch, where interpretation was guided by the belief that historical events in the 'old' scriptures were actually 'foreshadows' or 'types' of historical events to come. Regardless of differences in theory, however, the common underlying principles insured that accepted interpretations of the Hebrew scriptures remained mutually supportive of the Christian message.²⁵ The claims 'proven' by the interpretation were the claims said to have been hidden by God, and the claims said to have been hidden by God were the claims 'proven' by the interpretation.

That the truth of the Hebrew scriptures had been veiled and preserved for Christians, that it was only with the coming of Christ that the veil had been lifted, and that the correct understanding must be taught by church hierarchy were thus all common assumptions in early Christian biblical interpretation. Understanding itself was said to be dependent upon the "discovery and enunciation" of meaning, yet, importantly, conditions for "discovery and enunciation" depended upon being properly informed of the object of the scriptures, which was God. Yet being informed of God meant being informed of the triad father, son, and holy spirit, a concept which stood in direct contradiction to the Hebrew idea of a monotheistic God. Moreover, being so informed involved presupposing the very points being argued for: that Christ was hidden in the Hebrew scriptures, that the Jews never understood their own sacred writings, that God had

²⁴ C.K.Barrett, "Jew and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, Eds. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Sorogy (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976), 238. See also Werner Jaeger, who cites Gregoy of Nyssa's insistence in *Inscriptiones Psalmorum* that "even the historical books of the Old Testament were to be understood ...as transparent illustrations of great metaphysical or ethical truths;" *Early Christianity and Greek Paidea* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961), 53.

²⁵ See David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, for a discussion of the allegorical influence on Christianity. Runia cites French patristic theologian Jean Danielou and the Dutch historian of philosophy Cornelia de Vogel as claiming that allegorical interpretative methods not only allowed for a highly creative Christian reading of the Hebrew scriptures, they also set the stage for a "millenium and a half of religious philosophizing;" esp. pp.53-56. For modern day Protestant defense of allegorical interpretation, see Robert Louis Wilken, "In Defense of Allegory," *Modern Theology* 14.2 (April 1998); For historical explanation, as well as modern Catholic defense, see "Biblical Exegesis," *Catholic Encyclopedia*..

ordained that the Hebrew texts be translated into Greek for the benefit of Christians, and that only Christians had the key to unerring interpretation.²⁶

There was another condition as well. In Augustine's view, it was necessary that one face the scriptures with a "piety which gives him no option but to believe in and submit to the authority of scripture." Yet, by 'scripture,' Augustine meant the Christian canon of scripture that reflected "the judgment of the greater number of [orthodox] churches." His assertion that "the two testaments have one voice," meaning there was one author of both the divinely inspired books written before the coming of Christ (the 'old') and those written after Christ's death (the 'new'), rested on the foundational assumption that interpretation of the 'old' scriptures depended on the 'new.' The 'old' Hebrew scriptures were said to be merely the first part of God's revelation, and they could not be understood without the enlightenment of the 'new' and final revelation in the 'Christian testimonies,' later referred to as the New Testament. No aspect of the 'old' could be properly grasped except in light of the whole, which was itself dependent on the 'new,' and the interpretation of the whole could come only through the Christian church.²⁷

A notable early example of the efficacy of these methods to find the Christian supersessionist message in the hidden meanings of the Hebrew scriptures appears in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (ca.130). Here, the anonymous author combines two passages from *Genesis* to interpret the "doctrine of three letters" in Figure 1 below.²⁸ The three Greek letters, IHT, signifying the number 318 in the *Genesis* passage below - I=10, H=8, T=300 - are seen as a Greek monogram

²⁶ Origen, *On First Principles*, Book 4; Athanasius, *Letter to Marcellinus on Interpretation of the Psalms*; Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* I.1.1-5; Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on the Psalms*, Prologue.

²⁷ Augustine, *On Ch.Dctrine* I.1.1-5, II.8; *On Psalm 50*. See also Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 4.20.

²⁸ *The Epistle of Barnabas* is a pronounced example of supercessionist method, which can be described as the two-fold work of negating and voiding laws and institutions of Judaism, and the work of replacing that which has been negated with precepts and institutions of Christianity. *Barnabas* was considered scripture by early Christians, particularly those in Egypt, and as canonical in the oldest extant collection of Christian writings, *Codex Sinaiticus*.

for the name of Jesus, thereby revealing that both Jesus (IH) and his cross (T) are hidden in the number of men circumcised by Abraham.²⁹

Figure 1. Allegorical Christianization of Hebrew Scriptures in *Epistle of Barnabas*

Genesis 14.14: When Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his three hundred and eighteen trained servants who were born in his own house, and went in pursuit as far as Dan.

Genesis 17.23: Abraham took Ishmael his son, all who were born in his house and all who were brought with his money, every male among the men of Abram's house, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskins that very same day, as God had said to him.

Barnabas 9.7-8: Abraham, who first circumcised, did so looking forward in the spirit of Jesus, having received the doctrines of three letters. For [*Genesis*] says, 'he circumcised from his household eighteen men and three hundred.' What was the knowledge given [to] him [by God]? Notice that he first mentions the eighteen, then the three hundred. The eighteen is [signified] by the [Greek letters] I (=10) and H (=8) and there you have Jesus, and because the cross was destined...it then says 'three hundred' (T). Jesus is [thus] indicated in the first two letters and the cross in the other.

Such combining and 'reading' of the Hebrew scriptures is typical of early Christian claims. Jesus was seen not only in Greek letters but also in every sacrificial goat, calf, and lamb, and the cross of his crucifixion was 'read' into every piece of wood or tree mentioned in the Hebrew scriptures.³⁰ Such numerological, allegorical, and typological proofs were said to provide evidence that millennium-old Jewish laws, sacrifices, baptism, circumcision, Sabbath, and Passover were contrary to God's intention and operative constituents in what was described in *Barnabas* as the "present error" and "path of wickedness." From the second century on,³¹ forthright claims of possession to not only the Hebrew scriptures but the entire Jewish legacy -

²⁹ *Epistle of Barnabas* 9.7-8. IHT was the oldest Greek monogram for Jesus, adopted by both the Greek and Latin churches. See "Monogram of Christ," *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

³⁰ For example, *Barnabas* 3.6, 4.1, 4.10, 7.8; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* XX, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XL, XLI, XLII, LXXII-III, LXXXVI, XC, XCI; *Apology I*, XXXI; Tertullian, *Answer to Jews* X, XIII; Melito's *Homily on the Passion*, 1-40, which is an extended voiding of Jewish institutions. See Athanasius, Letter VI.2, for the negation of Passover on the grounds that it was so named "because [Jews] denied the Lord of the Passover."

³¹ For example, Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* XXXIX; Pseudo Justin, *Horatorio* VIII; Tatian, *ad Graecos* XXXI, XL; Theophilus, *Ad Autolychum* I, IV, XV, XVI, XXI, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXIX. This series of writings staked claim to the history and antiquity of Jews as refutations to charges that Christianity was an upstart religion with no claim to ancient truth. For further analysis see G.R. Boys-Stone, *Post Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of its Development from the Stoics to Origen* (Oxford University Press, 2001).

“our forefathers,” “the history of our laws,” “our sacred writings,” “our books,” “our doctrine” - were common. Indeed, *we/our/us* and *they/their/them* became standard for contrasting the “synagogue of the wicked” and those divinely called to replace it.³² Jewish history was interpreted as early Christian history, Hebrew patriarchs and prophets were interpreted as prototypical Christians, and the names ‘Israel’ and ‘Jews’ were interpreted as descriptors of Christianity and Christians - the ‘true and spiritual Israel’ and the ‘true and spiritual Jews.’³³ The name of God set forth in Exodus 3.15 - “My everlasting name is the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” - was resolved in the same interpretative manner. The only true and spiritual children of the Hebrew fathers were said to be Christians.

At the center of these ‘hidden meanings,’ each of which became part of the mounting argument that Christianity is the divine heir to everything once promised to Israel, was the Christian negation of God’s covenant with Jews, and it was crucially important, for supersessionism hinged on possession of the covenant. Two centuries before Christianity was deemed the official religion of the Roman Empire in the fourth century, the covenant was being discussed in terms of a divine conveyance of earthly “dominion.”³⁴ The anonymous author of *Barnabas* was already insisting to fellow Christians in ca.130 that the covenant was not both

³²*Barnabas* 5.13, 6.6.

³³ For example, Ignatius, *Phil.* IX, *Mag.* VIII; *Barnabas*, 9.7-8, 10.9; Justin, *Dialogue* VII, XXXVI. Early Christians also referred to themselves as the ‘spiritually circumcised,’ with the added thought from *Barnabas* 10.12 that spiritual circumcision invested one with the ability to understand the hidden meanings of the Hebrew scriptures. For examples of the Christianization of the names ‘Jews’ and ‘Israel’ see Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* XI, CXXIII, CXXXV; Augustine, *Tractate 117* and *On Psalms* 114.3. Please note that the supersessionist phrase “true Jews” to describe Christians should not be confused with the epithet “new Jews” used by the church fathers to denigrate heretics. For an example of claiming the ancestry of the patriarchs, see Augustine, *On Psalm 47.10*.

³⁴ *Epistle of Barnabas* 6.18-19, “To rule implies authority, so that one may give commandments and have domination.” See also 4.6-8; 13.1-6; 14.1-6. See also Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* XI, XVI, XXVI. See *Genesis* 25.23, and *Romans* 9.10-13 for the earliest Christian usage of this interpretation.

“theirs” and “ours,” but only “ours.” Christian possession of the covenant had been prophesied in *Genesis* when Isaac, Abraham’s son, and Rebecca, his wife, were informed by God that “two nations” were in Rebecca’s womb - and that the “lesser” of the two would rule the “greater.” By ca.185, according to Bishop Irenaeus, the “lesser” ruling over the “greater” included the idea of the “greater” being in bondage and the “lesser” free. The same was heralded from Carthage at the turn of the century by Bishops Cyprian and Tertullian, with the latter filling in the proper names, adding a causal necessity, and teaching that, having “attain[ed] the grace of divine favor from which Israel has been divorced,” the older (or greater) “Jews must necessarily serve...the Christian.”³⁵ By 236, Hippolytus, a disciple of Irenaeus and bishop of Rome, was teaching that Jews were divinely subjected to perpetual slavery and servitude. Using David’s prayer to be delivered from his enemies in *Psalms* 69.24, and reading it as if Christ himself was praying the same about Jews, Hippolytus interpreted the passage “let their eyes be darkened so that they do not see” as “[Jews] have been darkened in the eyes of [their] soul with a darkness utter and everlasting.”³⁶ The next part of the verse - “bend their back always”- was interpreted as Christ’s imprecation that Jews serve as “slaves to the nations, not [just] four hundred and thirty years as in Egypt, nor seventy as in Babylon, [but] bent to servitude...always” for the crimes they committed against him.

John Chrysostom of Antioch, in the last quarter of the fourth century, also taught from *Psalms* that Jewish servitude was part of “unending punishment” divinely visited upon Jews. “Servitude, captivity, deprivation of everything...[including] abandonment by God” were said to be among the imposed Jewish “misfortunes” with which “no part of the world is unacquainted.”

³⁵ Irenaeus, *Ag. Heresies* 4.21.1. Tertullian, *Prescription VIII; Answer to Jews I*; Cyprian, *Testimonies* I.19, 22, 25; see also Lactantius, *Epitome of the Divine Institutes*, 48.

³⁶ Hippolytus, *Expository Treatise Against the Jews* 6.

Comparing God's alleged perpetual punishment of Jews to the human practice of publicly impaling a murderer, he taught that in the case of the murderers of Christ, God had "made an example...of the living." Impaled alive, so to speak, Jews were to publicly suffer with "no relief" as "vagabonds and exiles and fugitives, roaming earth and sea, wanderers and nomads, homeless and enslaved, having forfeited freedom, fatherland, priesthood and all the rights [previously] enjoyed, dispersed [among] savages and countless other races, hated by all people, loathed, vulnerable to abuse by everyone. And rightly so..."³⁷

Yet such teachings were not original with either Chrysostom or Hippolytus. The idea of divine punishment of Jews was so well established by mid second century that Justin Martyr spoke of it as fact. Writing from Rome some sixty to seventy years after the Roman army had laid waste to Jerusalem in the war of 67-71 c.e., he attributed Jewish suffering during that war and exile after the war to God's wrath for having crucified Christ. Because God foreknew that the Jews would do so, Justin explained, he instituted the ritual of circumcision centuries before these punishing events so that Jews would be 'marked' and singled out to "suffer that which [they] justly suffer[ed]," noting that both cause and consequence had been prophesied in the Hebrew scriptures.³⁸ This teaching was affirmed by Tertullian, who, in ca.197 from Carthage, taught that circumcision was the identifying "sign" that prevented Jews from re-entering Jerusalem after being driven out, and that being cast out was a "fate... constantly foretold," one that Jews "were destined to suffer."³⁹ By the early fourth century, these beliefs were so accepted as historical truth

³⁷ Chrysostom, *On Psalm 8*, teaches that the phrase "destroy the enemy and the avenger" in verse 3 refers to the Jewish people under the divine wrath of God. By 'destroy,' he says, is meant "to annihilate their shamelessness, not to teach them; [for] the disease they are suffering from is incurable;" *Commentary on the Psalms*, Vol.1, translation and Introduction by Robert Charles Hill (Brookline, Mass: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1998), pp.154-177.

³⁸ Justin Martyr, *First Apology XLVII, Dialogue XVI*. For an earlier version see *Epistle of Barnabas* 16.

³⁹ Tertullian, *Answer to Jews* III, VIII, XIII; *Apology*, XXI.

that they were set down as one of the five “chief matters” reported in the earliest church history. Eusebius, the bishop of Caesarea who wrote the history, drew from an existing Jewish account of the Roman defeat of Jews, attached to it a Christian interpretation, and settled on the conclusion that the “entire Jewish race” was “immediately overwhelmed... after their conspiracy against our Savior.” In recounting the Jewish suffering during the war - Roman besieging of Jewish cities, flogging and crucifixion of Jewish leadership, “thousands and thousands...of every age... perish[ing] by the sword...and countless other forms of death ” - he pointed to the horrors of Jewish mass starvation as an especially instructive example of “how the [Jewish] crimes against the Christ of God...brought God’s vengeance on them.” This, as well as other explicit descriptions of Jewish suffering during the war, was said to offer proof of the “destruction that came upon [the Jews] by the judgment of God,” of “the penalty laid upon the Jews by divine justice,” and of the “disaster [that] befell the entire nation” because of their “crimes against Christ.”⁴⁰

To this enlarging nest of ideas about divine universal punishment of Jews must be added Augustine’s fifth century designation of Jews as divinely consigned librarians, walking behind their Christian masters, ‘blindly’ carrying the truths of Christianity.⁴¹ This “reproach” of carrying Christian books, as he explained in his teachings on *Psalms* 57 and 59, was part of the ‘mark’ on the crucifying enemies of God, as was the continuing practice of their divinely disenfranchised religion. To say this a little differently, circumcision, Passover, Sabbath, and all other specifically Jewish laws, rites, and customs, along with the ‘reproach’ of carrying the books, were said to serve as an identifying mark on Jews, with dual purpose.⁴² Jews were *necessary* to the Christian

⁴⁰ Cyprian, *Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews*, 6; Hippolytus, *Expository Treatise Against the Jews*, 7; Minicius Felix, *Octavius*, 33; Origen, *Contra Celsus*, 4.22; Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* 4.19, 21; *Epitome of Divine Institutes*, 4; Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* I.I; II. 5-6, 26; III.5-7.

⁴¹ Augustine, *On Psalm* 57.7.

⁴² *Ibid.*, *On Psalm* 59.1.18.

message, Augustine taught, as both “witnesses of their own iniquity and witnesses of Christian truth,” and for *both* of these reasons God had marked, preserved, and scattered Jews for the benefit of Christianity. In the same way that the mark on Cain had identified him as a murderer while warning against his slaying, so did the mark on Jews identify them as murderers of Christ while warning against their slaying as a people. Yet - and Augustine made this point carefully - the warning “do not slay” *in itself* was insufficient. Jews had to be both ‘not slain’ and scattered, or else, as he explained in *City of God*, “the church, which is everywhere, would not have [Jews] available among all nations as witnesses to the prophecies which were given beforehand concerning Christ.”⁴³ In order to expound to the world the truths of Christianity, he explained, “we produce documents from [the very] enemies” who carry the books containing the prophecies that condemn them.⁴⁴

The year after Augustine was baptized in 387, and some years before he characterized Jews as “enemies” who carry “our books,” there was a burning of a synagogue and an almost simultaneous burning of a heretical church in a northern Mesopotamian town, south of Edessa, the center of Syrian Christianity. Both acts of violence were instigated by an orthodox Christian bishop, carried out by monks, and initially condemned by Emperor Theodosius II (375-392), who demanded that the monks be punished and the synagogue be rebuilt at the expense of the bishop. Ambrose, the archbishop of Milan and Augustine’s baptizer, initiated a reversal of that decision, however, by convincing the emperor that neither the bishop nor the people should be “so severely punished for the burning of a...synagogue....which God himself ha[d] condemned.”⁴⁵ Arguing that

⁴³ Ibid., *On Psalm 59.1.19*.

⁴⁴ Ibid., *On Psalm 59.II.1*; *City of God* 18.46.

⁴⁵ Ambrose, *Letter XL.14*.

priests are “anxious for peace *except* when they are moved by some offence against God or insult to the church,” Ambrose defended the destruction by asking the question “what could the scheming Jews lose by the fire?,” by suggesting that the synagogue was “burnt by the judgment of God,” and by insisting that forcing a Christian bishop to rebuild a synagogue would be an act in defense of Jews *rather* than an act in defense of those who fight for the sake of Christ.⁴⁶ The great “sorrow to the Church,” he lamented to the emperor, was that rebuilding the synagogue, where Christ was denied, would give Jews “a triumph over the church of God...[a] trophy over Christ’s people...and [an] exultation...[and] rejoicing to the Synagogue.” To proceed with this rebuilding, he convincingly argued, would be to bow the “necks of the faithful...in captivity.”⁴⁷

That Christian necks might in some way be bowed to Jews was also the dread of numerous church councils. In 465 the Council of Vannes in France passed legislation which added a new dimension to the fathers’ long standing concern about clergy attending Jewish banquets. Since Jews could not eat foods prepared outside the restrictions of their own food laws, the Council ruled that it would be “shameful” for Christian clergy to eat food prepared by them. “If we consume what they serve, while they...despise what we [serve],” the canon decreed, then “clerics will begin to be inferior to Jews.” The canon was expanded at the 506 Council of Agde to include laymen so that Christians in general were forbidden to eat Jewish food, thereby avoiding occasion to “be inferior to Jews.” Legislation was also written at the Council of Macon in 581-583 which required Jews to “pay respect” to all Christian priests and “dare not sit in front of [them] unless ordered to do so.” In a different canon, the same council forbade Jewish ownership of Christian slaves on the grounds that it was “monstrous indeed that those whom the Lord Christ

⁴⁶ Ibid, 6,8,9,10,16,18. Italics are mine.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 19, 20, 26.

redeemed by the effusion of his blood should remain entangled in the chains of his persecutors.”⁴⁸

A century later in 593, Pope Gregory the Great (590-604) phrased the same concern as “God forbid [that] the Christian religion should be polluted by its subjection to Jews.”⁴⁹ Four years hence, he termed it “entirely grave and execrable” that Christians should be enslaved to Jews, and to Brunhild, Queen of the Franks, two years later, he equated the “wicked evil” of Jewish ownership of Christian slaves to enemies treading on Christ’s body.⁵⁰ Councils in Toledo (633) and Burgandy (647-653) followed in suit, respectively ruling “it is monstrous that members of Christ should serve the ministers of antichrist,” and “God forbid... [that] Christian slaves should be...in bondage to Jews.”⁵¹ The Twelfth Council of Toledo in 681 also echoed “God forbid” - in this case, “God forbid” that any king of Spain escape “the eternal punishment of malediction” if he should allow “a Christian slave [to] serve or wait on a Jew.”⁵² Other European councils also reasoned this way. Calling it “monstrous that the enemies of the Supreme Majesty and the Roman laws should dare molest...Christians, and even priests, under the pretence of a public office,” the council fathers of Meaux-Paris decreed in 845-846 that Jews could not receive “honors and dignities,” hold public offices, or work as judges, prison guards, and law

⁴⁸ Council of Vannes, Canon 12, 465; L465-6. Council of Agde, Canon 40, 506. Linder says the ruling was “extensively quoted and referred to by numerous councils and canonical collections,” 466-7. Council of Macon, C14, 16, L473-6.

⁴⁹ Gergory I, *To Libertinus*, May 593; L424-5. The following year, Gregory admonished the bishop of Luni to not allow Jews to own Christian slaves, “not so much out of [the danger of] persuasion, as to the right of power over them;” L426-7.

⁵⁰ Ibid, *To Candidus*; L 431-2, and *To Brunhild*; L 440-1. Five months earlier Gregory had learned that pagans were also buying Christian slaves, and he ordered the bishop of Naples to insure that they be “sold to Christian buyers within forty days,” without any mention of “God forbid” and without referring to the practice as “grave and execrable;” L436-438.

⁵¹ Council of Toledo IV, C66; Council of Chalon, C9; L491and 481-2.

⁵² Council of Toledo XII. A series of laws read to the Jews of Toledo on 1/27/681 stated that the council would “eradicate from its roots the plague of the Jews which always breaks out again in new madness;” L513-521; Hefele, vol.5, 207-214.

enforcement officials. They also adopted the same prohibition by the Councils of Vannes (465) and Agde (506) against eating at Jewish banquets, as well as the edict set forth by the Council of Macon (581-583) that Jews “dare not sit in front of priests unless ordered to do so,” all on the grounds that Christians should not be in subjection to Jews.⁵³ The same reasoning prompted the fathers of Pavia in Italy to write into canon law, ca. 850, that it was “completely senseless, obnoxious, and contrary to the Christian religion that Jews should exact taxes from Christians, or have any authority to judge Christians in either civil or criminal cases.”⁵⁴ In turn, the Council of Metz in Germany passed the 893 canon “that no one should eat or drink with Jews,” and the Italian fathers of Benevento (ca.900) forbade Jewish tax collectors and Jewish ownership of Christian slaves, on the respective grounds that Christians must not be “subjected to [Jews],” and that it is “monstrous indeed” for Christians to be slaves to “[Christ’s] persecutors.” That “Jews should not be appointed over Christians” was later invoked as the official title of a canon by the 1078 Council of Rome, to which the bishops of France were invited.⁵⁵

The underwriting belief in all of these ecclesiastical laws was, in the words of Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085), in “[raising] Christ’s enemies, you condemn Christ himself.”⁵⁶ Pope Gregory rendered this principle in a bull admonishing the king of Spain for elevating Jews to positions of authority, warranting it with the theological argument that “subjecting Christians to Jews...was oppressing God’s Church and exalting Satan’s synagogue.” Agreement on this set of beliefs appears to have been consistent, for that which Gregory VII made clear to the King of

⁵³ Council of Meaux-Paris, Canon 73, L539-548.

⁵⁴ Council of Pavia, L.548-9.

⁵⁵ Council of Metz, May 1, 893; L552-553; Council of Benevento, L.549-551. Council of Rome, Canon 22 is one of 12 canons that survive only in title, L.558-559.

⁵⁶ Gregory VII (1073-1085), *To King Alfonso of Spain*, L453-454. Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, p.38, dates this bull 1981.

Spain in 1081 - “beware” of the consequences of not being “perfectly obedient” to God in the matter of “subjecting Christians to Jews” - Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) made clear to the King of France in 1205 as “those who prefer the sons of the crucifiers... to the heirs of the Crucified Christ are exceedingly offensive” to God.⁵⁷ Moreover, in between this three hundred year span, the 1179 Third Lateran Council under Pope Alexander III (1159-1181) set forth in a universal decree dispensed to all of Christendom, both western and eastern, that “the only fitting condition is that Jews be placed below Christians.”⁵⁸

By the time of Innocent III, two decades later, the now universalized notion along with its attendant beliefs and arguments was being disseminated more rigorously and in increasingly provocative language. In the second year of his papacy, 1199, some six years before his aforementioned bull to the King of France, Innocent had warned the Spanish ecclesiastical hierarchy of Compostella and Leon that diminishing gifts to the church were forcing clergy to “not only beg but even do menial labor and serve Jews, to the shame of the church and all Christendom.”⁵⁹ Reproves for other such ‘shameful’ conditions - synagogues with roofs higher than churches, non-enforcement of Jewish ‘tithes,’ Jewish employment of Christian servants, ownership of Christian slaves, Jewish preference in legal testimonies, and Jews appearing (and laughing) in public streets on Good Friday - were also issued to the King of France, King of Castile, Duke of Burgandy, Counts of Toulouse and Nevers, Countess of Troyes, Archbishop of

⁵⁷Ibid.; Innocent III, *To the King of France*, January 16, 1205; G 104-109.

⁵⁸ Third Lateran Council, Canon 26, March 5, 1179, used this language to decree that legal testimonies of Christians be accepted over those of Jews; G 296-7. The Council, convened by Pope Alexander III, was attended by nearly one thousand representatives from Greece, Spain, England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Germany, Denmark, Hungary, Iceland, and the “Holy Land.” See Grayzel 296-7 for translation of canon; see *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Third Lateran Council,” for details of the Council.

⁵⁹ Innocent III, *To the Archbishop of Compostella and All Bishops of the Kingdom of Leon*, May 20, 1199; G 90-91.

Sens, and Bishops of Paris, Leon, and Auxierre over the next decade. Preferring the ‘sons of the crucifiers,’ as he phrased the problem in 1205 to the King of France thus included any of a number of such ‘Jewish offences,’ all of which he wanted removed from Christendom.⁶⁰

As a way of clarifying his position, Innocent opened that bull with the instruction, “it does not displease God, but is even acceptable to Him that [Jews] should live and serve under Catholic kings and Christian princes until such time as their remnant be saved.”⁶¹ When the desired response was not immediately forthcoming, he issued a bull six months later to the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Sens and Paris, informing that he had ‘asked’ the King of France and ‘ordered’ the Duke of Burgandy and Countess of Troyes to restrain Jews “so that they dare not raise their neck, bowed under the yoke of perpetual slavery.” He then “commanded” the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Paris to “zealously” convince the King and ruling nobility of southern France that “the perfidious Jews should not [be allowed] in any way to grow insolent, but, under fear of slavery, always show the timidity of their guilt and respect the honor of the Christian faith.” His purpose in suppressing ‘Jewish insolence’ was laid out clearly. Divine suppression allowed continuous opportunity for Jews to “recognize themselves” as they were recognized by Christianity: as “slaves rejected by God, in whose death they wickedly conspired,” and as “slaves of those whom Christ’s death set free at the same time that it enslaved them.”⁶²

He elaborated this theological position to the Count of Nevers in 1208, as part of his argument for *why* Jews “ought...to be forced into the servitude of which they made themselves deserving.” Like the murderer Cain, he explained, Jews had been divinely marked and set aside as homeless wanderers and in that condition they were to remain “until their countenance is filled

⁶⁰ Innocent III, *To the King of France*, 16 January 1205; G104-109.

⁶¹ Innocent III, *To the King of France*, 1205.

⁶² Ibid; *To the Archbishop of Sens and Bishop of Paris*, July 15, 1205; G114-117.

with shame and they seek [Christianity].” Even though “the blood of Jesus Christ calls out,” he instructed, Jews were to serve and not be slain - meaning precisely, he said, they “shall not [be] destroy[ed] completely.”⁶³

Indeed, to *not* extinguish but to preserve Jews in a state of compliant submission and servitude was clearly the papal expectation of the thirteenth century. Six out of eight popes between 1199 and 1268 explicitly propagated the teaching of perpetual Jewish servitude as divinely imposed punishment for alleged Jewish crimes against God and Christ. Of the two who did not, one lived only seventeen days, and the other, while not articulating it as the cause of divine punishment, made clear that Jews were forbidden to be in positions over Christians.⁶⁴ These teachings were bolstered by Lateran III under Pope Alexander III in 1179 and also by Lateran IV under Innocent III in 1215, which in the span of thirty six years put forth the universal decrees, respectively, that “the only fitting condition is that Jews be placed below Christians,” and “it is quite absurd that any who blaspheme against Christ should have power over Christians.” Moreover, with the exception of Honorius III, each papal teaching in Figure 2 below appears in the context of admonishments to secular and ecclesiastical European rulers who were not enforcing Church imposed restrictions against Jews, thus allegedly allowing Jews to raise necks that were supposed to be “bowed under the yoke of perpetual slavery.”⁶⁵

⁶³ Ibid, *To the Count of Nevers*, January 17, 1208; G126-131. See also *Constitutio Pro Judeis*, September 15, 1999; G92-94.

⁶⁴ Alexander IV, *To the Duke of Burgandy*, September 3, 1258; GII 64-66.

⁶⁵ Innocent III, *To the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Paris*, 1205; *To the Count of Nevers*, 1208; Honorius III, *To Isaac Avenveniste*, August 26, 1220. Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop, Bishops, and other prelates of the Church of Germany*, 1233; *To the Archbishop of Compostella and Suffragans*, 1233; *To the Abbot of Cluny*, 1234. Innocent IV, *To the King of France*, May 9, 1244. Urban IV, *To the King of Hungary*, July 19, 1263. Clement IV, *Peccatum Peccavit* (thought to be directed to the Archbishop of Gnesen in Poland, ca.1266). See Grayzel I &II.

Figure 2. Perpetual Jewish Servitude as Divine Punishment: Papal Teachings, 1198-1268

Innocent III (1198-1216): "Jews...by their own guilt, are consigned to perpetual servitude because they crucified the Lord." Jews "shall dare not raise their necks, bowed under the yoke of perpetual slavery, against the reverence of the Christian faith." "As slaves rejected by God, in whose death they wickedly conspired, they shall by the effect of this very action recognize themselves as the slaves of those whom Christ's death set free at the same time that it enslaved them." "The perfidious Jews should not in any other way grow insolent but, under fear of slavery, shall show always the timidity of their guilt..." Jews "ought to be forced into the servitude of which they made themselves deserving..."

Honorius III (1216-27): Jews are condemned "to perpetual slavery because of the cry by which they wickedly called down the blood of Christ upon themselves and their children."

Gregory IX (1227-41): Jews "ought to know the yoke of perpetual enslavement because of their guilt." They should not again dare to straighten their neck bent under the yoke of perpetual slavery in insult against the Redeemer." "They shall not dare to straighten their necks, bent under the yoke of perpetual slavery, against the honor of the Christian faith." "The perfidious Jews shall never in the future grow insolent, but...in servile fear they shall ever publicly suffer the shame of their sin." "The perfidious Jews, who are by their own guilt, condemned to perpetual slavery..."

Innocent IV (1243-54): "Since [Jews] were condemned to slavery by the Lord for whose death they sinfully plotted, they shall recognize themselves, as a result of this act, as ...as slaves of those whom the death of Christ set free while condemning them to slavery."

Urban IV (1261-64): Jews, "who, through their own fault, are condemned to perpetual servitude, and whom Christian piety permits to live by the side of Christians, should [not] exercise authority over Christians."

Clement IV (1265-68): Jews are "subjected to deserved servitude until, their faces covered with shame, they are compelled to seek the Lord."

Such admonishments fell into a category often described as Jewish excess, presumption, and insolence. Of 163 papal bulls written between 1199 and 1268, roughly 76 percent of these 'insolence complaints'⁶⁶ involved Jews being in positions over Christians,⁶⁷ Christians being in

⁶⁶ For ninth century claims of Jewish insolence, see *On the Insolence of the Jew* by Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon, to Emperor Louis the Pious, ca. 826-827, which contains a litany of typical Christian complaints about the impious behavior of Jews toward Christians; *Medieval Internet Sourcebook*. Beyond typical complaints of 'insolence and excess', there was a spate of claims involving money - either Jewish interest on Christian loans or church interest in Jewish money and possessions. Of these, there was slightly more papal concern that 'insolent' Jews were not being forced to pay church-imposed tithes and taxes than there was that Jewish interest on loans was exploiting the Christian poor.

⁶⁷ See, for example, Innocent III, *To the Archbishop of Sens*, 15 July 1205, and Innocent IV, *To the King of France*, 9 May 1244, for the commonly repeated claim that employment of Jewish nursemaids subject the "children of a free woman" to the "children of a slave;" G 115-117; 250-253. The same was also adopted

positions under Jews,⁶⁸ Jews being disrespectful to Christians and Christianity,⁶⁹ or Jews not being forced to abide by subjugating dress and badge codes.⁷⁰ That Jews were *expected* to accept the restrictions of their ‘divinely imposed’ status was a theme often visited by the popes of this period, as was expected Christian cooperation. Ruling nobilities were persistently prodded by these popes to demonstrate loyalty and obedience to God not only by correcting their own ‘faults’ in these matters but also the ‘faults’ of Christian subjects entrusted to them.⁷¹ Admonishments toward enforcement followed a pattern set in antiquity after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman empire. When Ambrose rebuked Emperor Theodosius I in 388 for considering to rebuild the torched synagogue, he warned that it was “a serious matter to endanger [one’s] salvation for the Jews.”⁷² In the same vein Pope Gregory the Great reproved Queen Brunhild in 599 for allowing “[Christ’s] enemies” to own Christian slaves, advising her that repression of the practice would make she and her constituents “worthier worshippers of the

by church councils, as in Canon 39 of the Council of Oxford, 7 April 1222, which stated “it is absurd that the children of a free woman shall be slaves to the children of a bondswoman; G 314-315.

⁶⁸ Muslim rise in status was also viewed as offensive and contrary to Christian purpose. See, for example, the undated bull by Alexander IV, *To Greek Churchmen*, which prohibits Jewish or Muslim physicians from caring for Christian patients on the grounds that doing so would make them “superior to the Christians;” GII 68-69. There is no indication, however, that Muslims were consigned to the category of perpetual servitude. It does appear, however, that Christian converts to Judaism were. In a treatise by Gerald of Wales, ca. before 1200, entitled “Two Cistercian Monks turn Jews,” a monk, who “fled with ruinous and ruin-bearing ways to Judaism, the home of damnation and the asylum of depraved reprobation,” was said to have “subject[ed] himself to eternal slavery, as well as the punishment of hell;” *Medieval Internet Sourcebook*.

⁶⁹ For example, see Clement IV, *To the Archbishops and Bishops of Poitiers, Toulouse, and the Provence*, 23 December 1267, who saw it as blasphemy against Christ for Jews to go outside their houses on “days of lamentation” and Passion Sunday or to open their doors and windows on Good Friday; GII 106-107.

⁷⁰ See, for example, Innocent IV, *To the Bishop of Maguelonne*, July 7, 1248, who was incensed that Jews wearing round wide capes were being scandalously mistaken for Christian clergy and receiving “sacerdotal honor and undeserved reverence;” G280-281. Other novel claims of insolence included selling meat, milk, and wine to Christians *after* providing for Jewish consumption.

⁷¹ Innocent III, *To Alphonso, King of Castile*, 1205. See also *To the Count of Nevers*, 1208: “We must promptly punish all disobedience...since we have for this purpose been appointed by God...”

⁷² Ambrose, *Letter XL*.26.

omnipotent Lord.”⁷³ Both aspects of these long held beliefs about ‘endangering’ or ‘enhancing’ one’s salvation through acts pertaining to Jews resonate in the papal bulls under discussion.

One’s salvation could be ‘endangered’ by committing acts that were contrary to church restrictions against Jews *or* by failing to commit acts that enforced those restrictions.⁷⁴ One’s salvation could be ‘enhanced,’ on the other hand, by acting in support of restrictions or by *not* committing acts that interfered with enforcement.⁷⁵ To cooperate was to submit to the church, as if to God, and work together with the church in both active and passive ways to uphold the common goal of achieving God’s purpose. To interfere was to hinder God’s purpose by coming between the church and the object of what was said to be God’s divinely assigned servitude. Interference could come about through acts of omission, such as not abiding by or not enforcing oppressive regulations against Jews, or through acts of commission, such as allowing or aiding Jews to sidestep regulations. Where church restrictions against Jews were not enforced, and policies thereby interfered with, the names of God and Christianity were said to be blasphemed, the “enemies of the Cross” were said to exalt themselves over Christians, Christian liberty was said to be “rendered less than Jewish servitude,” and any who allowed such confusion and disgrace to be brought upon the Christian faith were said to be subject to divine anger for show[ing] favor to those who dared to [crucify] the only begotten son of God.”⁷⁶

⁷³ Gregory I, *To Brunhild*; L440-1.

⁷⁴ For example, Innocent III *To Archbishop of Sens et al*, 1205, G114-117; *To the Count of Nevers*, 1205, G126-131.

⁷⁵ See Gregory IX *To the King of France*, October 6, 1237, *To the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Senlis*, March 22, 1238, and *To the Abbot of Joigny in the Diocese of Sens*, November 29, 1238, G232-237; Innocent III, *To the Count of Nevers*, 1208; G126-131. .

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, *To the King of France*, 1205, *To the King of Castile*, 120c, and *To the Count of Toulouse*, 1207; Honorius III, *To the Bishop of Porto, Apostolic Legate*, 1220; Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop of Compostella*, 1233; Innocent IV, *To the King of France*, 1244.

Warnings, admonishments, pleas, and demands for cooperation with church restrictions against Jews were in all these ways clad in papal authority, replete with both subtle and non-subtle reminders about the relation between obedience to church restrictions against Jews *and* one's standing with God. Bulls marked with the papal seal arrived wrapped not only in the words "force," "restrain," "suppress," "make haste to warn," or "zealously prevail," but also in the promise of "eternal reward."⁷⁷ Cooperation in upholding and enforcing restrictions against Jews was seen as demonstration that one "possess[ed] the zeal of the orthodox faith," as stated by Innocent III in 1208, or, by Pope Gregory VII in 1081 to the King of Spain - as a way of "repay[ing] Christ" for all that he suffered.⁷⁸ For those who needed more prodding there was also the promise of remission of sins to "restrain Jews from their presumptions," or excommunication for those who did not.⁷⁹

To this must be added the thought of the thirteenth century Dominican Thomas Aquinas, who died in 1274, was canonized in 1323, elevated to Doctor of the Church in 1568, and celebrated by pope after pope for his theological acumen.⁸⁰ In the decade before his death he was

⁷⁷ For example, Gregory IX who insisted in 1233 that Jewish "excesses" be "completely suppressed" in each diocese, church, and parish of Germany. For promise of eternal reward see Innocent III, *To the King of France*, 1205; and *To Philip, the Illustrious King of France*, 1208, where, in exchange for eternal reward, he is induced to force Jewish lenders to write off interest on loans to crusaders.

⁷⁸ Innocent III, *To the Count of Nevers*, 1208; Gregory VII, *To King Alphonso of Spain*, 1081.

⁷⁹ For remission of sins for restraining Jews and removing heretics, see Innocent III's 1205 bull to the King of France and Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop of Compostella and Suffragans*, 1233, who authorized the Archbishop to offer the King of Castile and Leon remission of sins to suppress named "excesses of Jews." Threats of excommunication also appear in legislation of church councils, as in the case of the Council of Meaux-Paris (845-846, which ruled in Canon 74 that any "who offer favor and support to the Jews against the faith of Christ" are to be expelled from the Church and "the Kingdom of God, for it is proper that one who becomes defender of the enemies of Christ should be separated from the body of Christ;" L 539-548

⁸⁰ Pope John XXII (1316-1334) proclaimed at Aquinas' canonization that his writings "enlightened the Church more than all other Doctors," and that "more profit [could] be gained in a single year by the study of his works than by devoting a lifetime to that of other theologians." Innocent VI (1352-1362) placed his teachings second only to the sacred scriptures, saying that "those who hold to [his theology] are never

called upon by the Duchess of Brabant to interpret church teaching on the servitude of Jews into permissible concrete action. The question posed to Aquinas was “whether at any time, and at what time, it [was] lawful to exact [material] tribute of Jews.” His reply, wholly in line with long-held theology, instructed that “as their sins deserve, the Jews are or have been given over into perpetual slavery, as the laws state, so that earthly lords may take their property as though it were their own, provided only that the things necessary to sustain life are not withdrawn.” Yet because Christians “ought to walk honestly even before those who are outcast,” he advised, “forced service should not be exacted of them where it has not been customary to do so.”⁸¹

Aquinas’ two-part answer not only reflects the theology under discussion, it also demonstrates how the idea of perpetual servitude defined Jews and their assets as types of Christian property. Less obvious is its reflection of the 1179 Lateran III ruling, which, after stating “the only fitting condition is that Jews be placed below Christian,”⁸² added that Jews should be “treated kindly by [Christians] solely for humanitarian reasons.” Pope Honorious IV (1285-1287), like Aquinas, also defined Jews in both feudalistic and humanitarian terms several decades later as “vassals of the churches” who should not be made to “suffer oppressive burdens.”⁸³ Both instances are remarkable because Christian reminders of piety and kindness

found swerving from the path of truth, [while those who] dare assail [it] will always be suspected of error.” Urban V (1362-1370) added that the theology of Aquinas should be followed as “the true and Catholic doctrine.” By the early eighteenth century, some thirty-eight such bulls had been issued by eighteen popes, with more to come. See “Aeterni Patris,” Pope Leo XIII, 1879: “St. Thomas Aquinas,” *Catholic Encyclopedia*; and “St. Thomas Aquinas,” Placid Conway, University of Notre Dame, Jacques Maritain Center: (www2.nd.edu/Departments/Maritain/etext/conway04.htm).

⁸¹ Thomas Aquinas, *To the Duchess of Brabant ‘On the Government of Jews*: “You can [therefore] exact tribute of the Jews according to the custom of your predecessors, provided that there is no other reason why you should not do so;” *Aquinas, Political Writings*, edited and translated by R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 233-238.

⁸² Lateran III Council, Canon 26.

⁸³ Honorious IV, *Dilectus Filius*, September 17, 1285, GII, 155-157.

toward Jews were more commonly wrapped in the context of complaining that the kindness of Christians was being taken advantage of by Jewish presumption. Yet neither Aquinas' humanitarian duty to "walk honestly even before those who are outcast," nor Honorius' notion of limiting "oppressive burdens," altered their theology of divine Christian dominion and perpetual Jewish servitude. Nor did it alter the number of church restrictions against Jews based on that theology. Thirteenth century councils, both prior to and after Honorius' affirmation of Aquinas, continued to "insure that Jews not be of higher status than Christians," and the theological premise that "Christians are free men while Jews live in a state of perpetual servitude" continued to inform beliefs that underwrote the measures of the councils.⁸⁴

Beyond the business of preserving Jews in their 'divinely' imposed perpetual servitude, there was also the theological necessity of preserving Jews as both archetype of God's enemy and witness to Christian truth - impaled alive, as Chrysostom had taught in the late fourth century, and scattered, according to Augustine in the fifth. As an illustration of how these teachings fitted together by late seventh century, the Council of Toledo XVII convened in 694 to accuse the Jews of Spain of attempting to rise from their 'fitting condition' and "throw the order of the Church into confusion." Jews were further charged with attempting to "ruin the fatherland and the whole people in a tyrannical conspiracy" with other European Jews. Convoked by the Visigoth king and well attended by bishops and palatine counts, the Council ruled the following "irrevocable sentence."⁸⁵ Jews, "defiled with the vilest stain of sacrilege [and] stained with the blood of Christ," were to be "stripped of all their properties...and [along] with their wives and sons, as well

⁸⁴ For example, Council of San Quentin, 1271, GII, 278, and Synodus Incerti Loci, under Archbishop of Gneznen, Poland, 1285, GII, 280; Synod of Exeter, 1287, GII, 257; Council of Zamora, December 18, 1312 through January 1313: "Jews should enjoy no privileges benefiting them at Christian expense," GII, 267.

⁸⁵ Council of Toledo XVII, 694, Canon 8, "On the Condemnation of the Jews;" L529-538.

as their progeny, [were to] be exiled... throughout the provinces of Spain and subjected to perpetual slavery... remain[ing] dispersed everywhere.”

The ruling came on the heels of a canon passed the previous year at the Council of Toledo XVI (693). In this “gathering of five metropolitans, fifty-nine bishops, five abbots, three delegates of bishops, and sixteen palatine counts,” under the direction of the same king, the Council had unanimously ruled that “all decrees and laws clearly intended by our predecessors in the Catholic faith for the destruction of [Jewish] perfidy should be assiduously applied ...and observed with even greater fervor.”⁸⁶ The 693 ruling, like that of 694, was steeped in the idea that Jews “should either be converted to the faith or consistently punished by harsher pains if they persist[ed] in their perfidy.” As long as Jews of Spain so persisted, the 694 Council ruled, they were to remain exiled “people singled out perfectly by the numerous stains of their crimes,” and subjected to perpetual slavery under whomever the King of Spain “order[ed] them to serve.” Some four hundred years later, little had changed in this theology. While instructing the bishops of Spain to not baptize Jews by force, Pope Alexander II (1061-1073) affirmed that the ‘fitting condition’ of Jews, ever “since the loss of their freedom and fatherland,” is to “live dispersed in all parts of the world, condemned to lasting penance for the crimes of their fathers in the effusion of the savior’s blood.”⁸⁷

Whether these degrading categorizations as witnesses of Jewish iniquity and Christian truth ironically saved Jews from extermination in the Middle Ages has been the topic of scholarly discussion. Some have argued that the harsh teachings of deicide and deserved perpetual punishment, coupled with the ‘preserve and do not slay’ argument, produced a Christian

⁸⁶ Council of Toledo XVI, 693, “On the Perfidy of the Jews;” L.521-529.

⁸⁷ Pope Alexander II, *To the Bishops of Spain*, 1065, L.451-453. While it “just” to fight Muslims, the pope instructs, Jews “live dispersed in all parts of the world, condemned to lasting penance for the crimes of their fathers in the effusion of the savior’s blood.” They are, thus, “everywhere ready to serve.”

ambivalence that manifested in violence toward Jews, on the one hand, and benevolent papal protection of Jews, on the other.⁸⁸ While such conflicting actions indeed appear ambivalent, the twin precepts that informed church teachings about Jews were not. Theological doctrines concerning the divinely subjugated status of Jews were set out clearly and consistently by the highest church authorities. In terms of not slaying Jews, meaning not destroying them completely, the precepts that informed papal thought and action were mutually dependent operatives functioning in the form of a conditional. *If* Christianity was to be pronounced to the world as inheritor of the one and only divine covenant with the one and only God, as prophesied in the Christian-interpreted Hebrew scriptures, *then* the keepers of those scriptures had to be both *dispersed* and *preserved* in their divinely assigned role as witnesses to Christian truth.

As we have come to see, however, being preserved as ‘witness’ was not just a matter of ‘carrying the Christian books.’⁸⁹ Wherever the doctrine was espoused, it came wrapped in the full array of supersessionist claims that lay at the heart of the Christian message - that Jews never understood their own scriptures, that the scriptures foretold Jews would crucify Christ, that Christians would inherit the covenant, that God would abandon Jews in perpetual punishment under the dominion of Christendom. All of this was understood to rest under the category of Christian truth to which Jews could be pointed as witnesses. That Jews constituted the archetype of iniquity was part of this, as was the precept that they should ensue in the state of perpetual punishment and suffering until they turned to Christianity, as illustrated in Figure 3 below.

⁸⁸ Kenneth Stow, “The Fruit of Ambivalence: Papal Jewry Policies Over the Centuries,” *The Roman Inquisition, the Index, and the Jews*, Stephen Wendehorst, ed. (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2004), 3-17; *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555-1593* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1977), 3-59.

⁸⁹ For example of a non-papal ‘witness’ teaching see the twelfth century treatise to the bishop of Worcester from Peter of Bloise, entitled *Against the Perfidy of the Jews* (before 1198): “life is allowed to the Jews of today because they are our treasures...they confirm the prophecies on our faith and the law of Moses. We read the Passion of Christ, not [only] in their books but in their faces.” Joseph Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England: Documents and Records* (London, 1893), 179-82; Internet Medieval Sourcebook.

Figure 3. Perpetual Servitude/ Do Not Slay: Papal Teachings, 1198-1268⁹⁰

Pope Innocent III (1198-1216): the Jews, against whom the blood of Jesus Christ calls out...ought not be killed, lest the Christian people forget the divine law. Yet as wanderers ought they to remain upon the earth until their countenance be filled with shame and they seek the name of Jesus Christ, the Lord. Thou shall not kill them...or more clearly stated, thou shall not destroy the Jews completely, so that Christians should never by any chance be able to forget thy law, which, though [Jews] themselves fail to understand, they display in their books to those who do.

Gregory IX (1227-1241): Although the perfidy of the Jews is to be condemned, nevertheless their relation with Christians is useful, and in a way necessary...They are therefore not to be destroyed. The proof for the Christian faith comes, as it were, from their archives and...in the end of days a remnant of them shall be saved.

Innocent IV: Jews have been preserved specifically to testify to the orthodox faith. Divine justice has never cast the Jewish people aside so completely that it reserves no remnant of them for salvation. Jews were left as witness of his saving passion and of his victorious death. It is from the archives of the Jews, as it were, that the testimony for the Christian faith has come forth. Thy shalt not kill.

Clement IV (1265-68): The Synagogue [was]given its bill of divorcement [and] this blind and grievously sinful people...has been made to wander over the earth like the fratricide Cain, who was driven from the face of God because his crime was too great for forgiveness. This miserable people likewise denied the Son of the Eternal Father, the Lord Jesus Christ...felled him, and flogged him, and impiously killed the Crucified One, calling His blood down upon themselves and their children. The Jewish people, like the fratricide Cain, has become a fugitive upon the earth...Yet they are not to be killed, lest the law of God be forgotten. A remnant of them must be saved. They are, however, subjected to deserved servitude until, their faces covered with shame, they are compelled to seek the Lord. Jews are dispersed among the Christian peoples in testimony of their ancestral crime, so that out of their confusion the glory of our faith may be manifest.

Any uncertainty about how these teachings fitted together seemed solely to rest in *how* these mutually dependent Christian-assigned Jewish roles were translated from abstract theology into concrete actions in society. While the mutually dependent premises - preserve in servitude but do not destroy completely - were understood theologically by the highest authorities, such

⁹⁰ Innocent III, *Constitutio Pro Judeis*, September 1199; *To the Count of Nevers*, January 1208. Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop and Bishops of France*, 1233; *To the Archbishop of Bordeaux and Bishops of Saintes, Angoulême and Poitiers*, *To the Bishops of Sees, Avranches, and Archbishop-Elect of Rouen*, *To the Archbishop of Tours and Bishops of Le Mans, Aners, Rennes, Nantes, and Quimper*, *To the Archbishop-Elect of Bourges*, *To the King of France*, all on September 5, 1236. Innocent IV, *To the King of Navarre*, October, 1246, June and July, 1247; *To the Archbishop of Vienne*, May, 1247; *To the Archbishops and Bishops of Germany* July, 1247. Clement IV, *To the King of Aragon*, July 15, 1267; *Peccatum Peccavit*, ca.1265 or 1266, likely sent to the Archbishop of Gnesen; *Cum De Tam*, no date, addressed to an unknown bishop.

certainty appears to have diminished as the teachings trickled down to the masses via the ecclesiastical and secular hierarchies. Both German crusaders on their way to the holy land in 1096 and French crusaders going against southern French heretics in 1236, for example, failed miserably to balance the ‘do not slay’ doctrine with the teachings that Jews were *both* God’s enemy and a witness to Christian truth. In the case of the 1096, four cross-bearing armies led by German nobles under the command of Counts Emicho of Leiningen and Hartmann of Dillingen massacred 12,000 Jews in the German Rhineland during the months of May and June, on the grounds that the murderers of Christ be “wiped out” if they failed to convert to Christianity.⁹¹ In the 1236 case during the Albigensian Crusade in southern France, those who had taken up the cross slaughtered 2500 Jews, “old and young, as well as pregnant women,” leaving their bodies to the birds and jackals, burning their books, and carrying off their goods, on the grounds that the enemies of Christ “refuse to be baptized.”⁹²

While many things happened in the hundred and forty years between those atrocious events, a change in the theology that propagated perpetual punishment of Jews while prohibiting Jewish extinction was not one of them. It took twenty years for the first papal declaration of Jewish protection to be issued after the 1096 Rhineland slaughters, but once it was issued by Pope Callistus II (1119-1124) the document was reissued near or in conjunction with the onset of each of five additional crusades to the holy land during the remaining hundred and twenty years.

⁹¹ Recent research dispels the earlier idea that crusader massacres were carried out by uncontrolled peasant crowds. In addition to the two Germany armies of Emicho and Hartmann, scholars include the German Counts of Roetteln, Zweibruecken, Salm, Viernenbert, and Bollanden; a third army of French, English, Flemish, and Lorrainer crusaders under leadership of lords, counts, and viscounts; a fourth made up of nobles and knights under the leadership of Peter the Hermit, a priest in northern France; and a fifth made up of Saxons and Bohemians, led by the priest Folcmar, slaughtering Jews around Prague. Jonathan Riley-Smith, “The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews,” *Studies in Church History*, Vol.21 (1984, 51-72); Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade* (Oxford University Press, 2004), 83-99.

⁹² Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop of Bordeaux and to the Bishops of Saintes, Angouleme and Poitiers*, September 5, 1236. G226-228.

Known as *Sicut Judeis*, this bull of papal protection incorporated the ‘toleration but no authority’ policy of Pope Gregory the Great, the same late sixth century pope who issued the first ‘God forbid that Christians should be subjected to Jews.’ The expanded twelfth century version, issued by Callistus and reissued by subsequent popes throughout the period under discussion, addressed four central ideas. The first, concerning the addressee, is that the protective bull was issued to “all faithful Christians.” Secondly, the bull made clear that, *even though* Jews persisted in their refusal of Christianity, they were to be tolerated within the limits of ecclesiastical and civil laws. Third, protection extended to Jews included specifically that they not be wounded or killed without the authority of the land in which they lived, violently forced into baptism, forced into service beyond customary and accepted practices, robbed, pelted with sticks and stones, or otherwise harassed during religious observances. The desecration of Jewish cemeteries was also prohibited, as was the apparently common practice of exhuming Jewish corpses for ransom. Last, so as to determine the just beneficiaries of the document, *Sicut* closed with a qualifying statement that reflected more than a thousand years of Christian claims against Jews: “We desire, however, to place under the protection of this decree only those Jews who do not presume to plot against the Christian faith.”⁹³

The oft overlooked result of *Sicut* is that at the same time that it and its ‘disclaimer’ were being issued to forestall violence against Jews, so was the mainline teaching that Jews were deserving of divinely imposed punishment for their crimes God and the church. When *Sicut* was issued for the second time, for example, Pope Eugene III (1145-1153) did so in conjunction with the launching of the second crusade to the holy land. The resulting fervor for the cross was so great that Bernard of Clairvaux, who was requisitioned by Eugene to preach the crusade, ended

⁹³ Solomon Grayzel, “The Papal Bull *Sicut Judeis*,” *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: From Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, edited by Jeremy Cohen (New York and London: New York University Press, 1991), 243-280; *Sicut Judeis*, GI 92-95.

up having to preach also against a monk who was himself preaching throughout the Rhineland a theology of murdering Christ's unrepentant murderers. As part of Bernard's effort to dispel gathering fury against Jews, he invoked Augustine's 'hidden' teaching from *Psalms* to remind Christians that Jews were to be saved from extermination for a reason:

Ask anyone who knows the sacred scriptures what is foretold of the Jews in *Psalms*, [and they will say], 'not for their destruction.' The Jews are for us the living words of scripture, for they remind us always of what our Lord suffered. They are dispersed all over the world so that expiating their crime they may everywhere be the living witnesses of our redemption.⁹⁴

Sicut was issued a third time by Pope Alexander III, who did so in conjunction with the 1179 Lateran III ruling on Jewish 'fitness,' placing it alongside the canon which decreed that 'the only fitting condition is that Jews be placed below Christians,' and reinforcing the unsubtle implication that Jews must be kept within their divinely consigned place *if* they were to be tolerated and preserved. By 1236 and the massacre of 2500 Jews in southern France, Popes Innocent III, Honorius IV, and Gregory IX had all reissued *Sicut*, but they had also repeatedly propagated the mainline teachings of Jews as guilty beyond measure and perpetually condemned to divine punishment. Papal condemnation of the French massacre, as evidenced by nearly identical letters written by Gregory IX on September 5, 1236 to the King of France and Archbishop of Bordeaux, indeed inveighed strongly against the violent crusaders, yet in spite of his concern Pope Gregory did not rein in his teachings about the guilt and deserved punishment of Jews.⁹⁵ Nor did he hesitate to call for more and harsher restrictions on the grounds of those

⁹⁴ Bernard of Clairvaux, Epistle 363, To the English People, the Lords, Fathers, the Archbishops, Bishops, and All the Clergy and People of Eastern France and Bavaria (1146), *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, translated by Bruno Scott James (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), 460-463.

⁹⁵ Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Bishops of Saintes, Angouleme, and Poitiers*, September 5, 1236, where he argues that the Jews could not completely be destroyed because "proof for the Christian faith comes...from their archives."

teachings. Less than three years after condemning the unjust treatment of Jews, he issued a series of equally incensed letters to the Kings of France, England, Aragon, Navarre, Castile, Leon, and Portugal, all of which began: “if what is said about the Jews of France and other lands is true, no punishment would be sufficiently great or sufficiently worthy of their crime.” He was referring to the ‘dangerous’ Jewish Talmud, which, he said, “contained matter so abusive and so unspeakable that it arouses shame in those who mention it and horror in those who hear it.”⁹⁶ In speaking this way, and then ordering all Jewish books to be taken by force, examined for errors, and “burned at the stake,” the reigning Pope of Christendom again increased the margin of error for societal understanding of the fixed premises that informed ecclesiastical thought and rulings on Jews in Christendom. He also helped to bring into focus the inestimable tension created by these mutually dependent theological teachings, one that pressed Jews as if in a vise throughout the remainder of the Middle Ages.

⁹⁶ Ibid., *To the Archbishops Throughout the Kingdom of France*, June 9, 1239; *To the Kings of Portugal, France, England, Aragon, Castile, Leon, Navarre*, June 20, 1239; *To the Bishop of Paris, Prior of the Dominicans, and Minister of the Franciscan Friars*, June 20, 1239; GI240-244.

CHAPTER III
THE MAKING OF GOD’S ENEMY:
A CHRIST-KILLING PROTOTYPE

When *Sicut Judaeis* was first issued twenty years after the crusader massacres of Jews in 1096, and in nearly every case of re-issuance by twenty-three popes over the course of the next four centuries, this papal bull of Jewish protection contained a statement which limited its relevance to Jews who did not “presume to plot against the Christian faith.”¹ The belief informing this statement - that Jews are perpetual enemies of Christianity - had been vigorously developed by the church fathers from the early second century on, handed down in succession as traditional teaching, and, as evidenced by its formulaic presence in four centuries of *Sicut Judaeis*, incorporated into general Church policy and canon law.² Such enemy status was said to be denotative of the division between “Israel the enemy of Christ” and “the Israel which attaches itself to Christ,” and this division, like divinely imposed suffering of Jews, was viewed as a sentence “utterly irrevocable...divinely proclaimed...[and] absolutely perpetual.”³

¹ Solomon Grayzel, “The Papal Bull *Sicut Judaeis*,” 244-280, and Grayzel, GI, 93-95, for English translation of the bull. There is no extant copy of Calixtus II’s first *Sicut*, ca.1120, but Grayzel’s standard work credits him with the limiting provision, and he does so again a decade later in “Popes, Jews, and Inquisition, From ‘Sicut’ to ‘Turbato.’ ” The bull was subsequently issued by Eugenius III (1145-53); Alexander III (1159-81); Clement III (1187-91); Coelestine III (1191-8); Innocent III (1198-1216), the earliest extant *Sicut* with the limiting provision; Honorius III (1216-27); Gregory IX (1227-41); Innocent IV (1243-54); Alexander IV 1254-61); Urban IV (1261-4); Gregory X (1271-6); Nicholas III (1277-80); Martin IV (1281-5); Honorius IV (1285-7); Nicholas IV (1288-92); Avignon Pope Clement VI (1342-52); Urban V (1362-70); Martin V (1417-31); Eugene IV (1431-47); Nicholas V (1447-1455); Pius II (1458-1463); Sixtus IV (1471-84); Paul III (1534-49). Kenneth Stow dates the relevant statement to the first extant bull rather than to Calixtus II in “Hatred of the Jews or Love of the Church: Papal Policy Toward the Jews in the Middle Ages,” *Antisemitism Through the Ages* (1988), 71-89.

² Ibid., 243. As a bull of general policy *Sicut* was part of a body of documents from which canon laws were derived.

This designation was not to be understood in terms of a personal Christian enemy, but as the enemy of God. Such distinction is important to understanding the ancient Christian concept of ‘enemy’ for while Christian doctrine held that adherents should love their personal enemies, it held concurrently that they should hate, with a ‘perfect hatred,’ the enemies of God.⁴ Not only was it “a lawful thing to hate God’s enemies,” as pleasing taught by Saint Gregory Nyssa in ca.390, “this kind of hatred [was said to be] to our Lord.”⁵ In the early second century, as a defining characteristic of those who proclaimed to love God and hate evil, such hatred was expressed as a moral and spiritual obligation. The imperatives of that early period - “you ought to hate wickedness” and “you ought to hate those who hate God” - were later transformed by Augustine into the enduring fifth century maxim that one “who lives by God’s standards has a duty of perfect hatred toward those who are evil.”⁶ As a theological principle which included the holy criterion of loving the human creation while hating the evil that dwells in it, ‘perfect hatred’ was invoked as a sanctified and just attitude toward God’s enemies, the hallmark characteristic of which was said to be hatred of God. As applied to Jews from the second century on, most often in the absence of its holy criterion, ‘perfect hatred’ functioned as a *counter* to the alleged Jewish hatred of God that was claimed to be the underlying cause of the crucifixion and, hence, the primary attribute that circumscribed Jews as ‘the enemy of God.’⁷

³ Augustine, *City of God* XVII.7. Typological interpretation of *I Samuel* 15.29 (“Israel will be divided into two”) and *Psalms* 109.1 (“sit at my right hand until I put your enemies under your feet”) allowed Augustine to find the hidden meaning: “Israel the enemy of Christ” has been divinely placed under the feet of the “Israel which attaches itself to Christ.”

⁴ *Matthew* 5:43-44, *Luke* 6:27 and 35, *Psalms* 139.21-22; Augustine, *On Psalm 139* and *City of God* XIV.6.

⁵ Gregory Nyssa, *Letter 17*.

⁶ Ignatius’ *Epistle to Phillipians* III, ca. 108; *Epistle of Barnabas* 4.1, ca. 130; Augustine, *On Psalm 9*. For a later example of such ‘duty,’ see Albert of Aix’s report of 1096 crusaders calling the slaughter of Jews “their duty against the enemies of the Christian faith,” Peters, 102-04.

⁷ For example, John Chrysostom taught in *Sermons Against Jews* (5.4, 5.8, 6.7) in 386-387 that “we must hate [the Jews] and their synagogue,” that one who loves God never tires of fighting against the Jews, and

With hatred of God being the greatest of all evils and first in the hierarchy of all sins, this claim of Jewish hatred for God - said to continue in generational succession - not only remained central to the deicide charge, it ensured that Jews remained fixed as the preeminent hating enemy in Christendom. Jews were not only presented in church teachings as the *first* and most lasting haters of Christ, Christianity, and Christians but, also, as haters of humanity, ‘evidenced’ by their alleged murder of the one who came to save humanity, as haters of good, ‘evidenced’ by their alleged alliance with the source of evil, and as haters of divine truth, ‘evidenced’ by their alleged ongoing attempts to undermine the integrity of Christian doctrine. To be designated the hating enemy of any of these was to be designated the hating enemy of the others, for all were said to be embodied in the divinely established institution of Christianity.

In this enemy status, as reflected in four centuries of *Sicut Iudaeis*, Jews were “presume[d] to plot against the Christian faith.”⁸ While Jews were indeed charged with overt acts of destruction against the Church, the more predominate claim running throughout ancient and medieval Christian writings - and the one of most interest to this study - is that Jews operate through covert means to tamper with, weaken, and destroy the truth of Christianity. Only one truth was said to exist and it fell under the domain of Christianity, the inception of which was said

that Christian martyrs take great pleasure in their hatred of Jews and in observing the continuing fight against them. See Lactantius’ *Divine Institutes* 4.20 for an example of the teaching that God himself hated the Jews. St. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, CXXXVI, was one of the earliest fathers (ca.135) to make hatred central to the deicide charge: “the highest pitch of [Jewish] wickedness lies in this, that [they] hate the Righteous One, and slew Him.” In addressing the theological challenge of how Jews could be held accountable for the murder of God *if* God had come to earth for the specific purpose of dying, Augustine focused on hatred as a motive rather than the actual act of killing, while granting that Christ offered himself as the innocent sacrifice. See his *On Psalm 109.1-6* for the teaching that Jewish hatred of God was a greater crime than the crucifixion, as well the teaching that Jews are “enemies of Christ” who hated him and continue as a “species of wickedness” in a “line of succession” to hate him. That such teaching trickled down is evident in Guibert of Nogent’s report on the 1096 crusaders who called the Jewish enemy “more hostile to God than any other race.” See Jonathan Riley Smith, “The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews,” *Studies in Church History*, Vol.21 (1984), 51. For the theological classification of hatred in the hierarchy of sins, see Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*.II.II.34.2.

⁸ GI, 93-95.

to have signified the end of Judaism. As representatives of this ‘invalid’ theology, Jews were labeled as deceptive ‘imitators’ who stand completely removed from truth while “appear[ing] to approach the truth more than all [other] nations.” Claims of deception were also made about Christian heretics, pejoratively and often, but, importantly, such claims appear only after Jews have been posited as the *first* to do violence to God’s truth. Moreover, when the first claims against Christian heresies appear, the alleged heretics under discussion are described according to established categories of Christian-imposed attributes of Jews. This is not to say that Jews were described as heretics in these early discussions of heresy but rather that heretics were described *as Jews*. Attempts to understand the significance of this descriptive relation as it unfolds can be helped by laying aside the presumption that claims of heresy in the early church had solely to do with errors in belief among members of the professing group, the boundaries of which were distinguished by an orthodox set of doctrines. In this narrow sense heresy can indeed be understood as internal opinions which contradicted or subverted orthodoxy, where orthodoxy is understood to be the divine teachings given to the apostles and passed on in succession through Christian bishops. But in the more encompassing sense of Christianity’s ‘supremacy of truth’ doctrine, the concept of heresy as it developed in the early church can be better understood as including all of the aforementioned *plus* any contradictory set of beliefs about God outside the boundaries of Christianity.⁹

Matters of heresy, or more correctly, what were said to be heresies, involved not only contending with that which was internally contradictory to Christian orthodoxy but also that

⁹ Aristides, *Apology* XIV-XVII, ca.125 (italics mine). Aristides was the first Christian apologist to make this threefold claim adopted by the fathers: that Judaism only *seems* to be a purveyor of truth; that Jews stand removed from truth because they received the son of God with “wanton violence;” and that Christians alone have possession and authority to dispense God’s truth. See also Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* XXIX; *First Apology* XXIII; Pseudo-Justin, *Horatory Address to the Greeks* XIII; Irenaeus, *Ag. Heresies* 4.26.1; Tertullian, *Prescriptions* III; Cyprian, *Testimonies* 4,5; Athanasius, *To Marcellinus* 21.

which was externally contradictory. Christian overseers of truth fought among themselves violently and often, deposing, exiling, rioting, and kidnapping one another over what was and what was not Christian truth and heresy. Attacking the character of internal theological opponents was part of this, but so was the common practice of reaching beyond the boundaries of Christianity to involve and stain the character of Jews and Judaism. In the case of the latter, this was more than a matter of sibling rivalry for converts, as is often simplified. The denigrating polemics that issued from the early fathers, whether directed internally to Christian heretics or externally to Jews, stemmed primarily from the perceived urgency that *theological* adversaries were a more immediate threat to ‘Christian truth’ than either polytheistic or atheistic pagans. Claiming the same God, albeit with a different set of doctrines, as Jews and Christian heretics both did, was clearly a greater menace to the tenets of Christianity than the pagan claim that the monotheistic God was nonexistent. While Jews, heretics, and pagans alike were cast into the genus ‘enemies of God,’ only Jews and heretics, in that order, were fitted into the more threatening sub-category of ‘theological enemies.’ Both Jews and heretics were perceived that way because they dared to profess opposing doctrines about the same monotheistic God to whom Christianity made exclusive claim, and both - Jews first and then Christian heretics - were assigned the attribute of ‘deceivers’ against whom ‘truth-seekers’ were warned to stand guard.

In the early second century, when Christianity was emerging from Judaism as a belief system not only distinct but one that replaced Judaism as God’s plan for humanity, Bishop Ignatius of Antioch penned the belief that any who call themselves other than ‘Christian’ are not of God.¹⁰ Referring to himself and the Christians to whom he wrote as “God-bearers,” “Christ-bearers,” and Bearers of Holiness,” he claimed the primacy of Christianity on the grounds that it

¹⁰ *The Epistles of Ignatius* are comprised of seven last-minute letters written on his way to martyrdom.

is founded on the transference of God's promises and covenant *from* Jews and Judaism *to* Christians and Christianity. 'Be not deceived,' 'beware of Christ-betrayers,' and 'avoid their wicked offshoots' were some of his many exhortations directed to those who thought, or might yet come to think, that the lines between Judaism and Christianity could in any way be blurred. There could be no blurring, he warned, for any mixing of Christianity with the "evil, old, and sour leaven" of Judaism was to tamper with truth and in effect deny the cross of Christ "no less than the Jews who killed [him]." ¹¹

The word Ignatius used in ca.108 to denote the evil and destructive process of mixing Judaism with Christianity - *ioudaizo* or Judaize - was one that he inherited from his Christian predecessors. Prior to both Ignatius and his predecessors, however, the idea of 'Judaizing' had not been burdened by an association with evil. The term 'Judaizer' was at first a Jewish construct used benignly to describe non-Jewish worshippers of God who followed Judaism in whole or in part without converting to Judaism. ¹² The prototype is thought to have been Naaman, a commander of the Syrian army, in a ninth century b.c.e. story in *II Kings*, who paid outward homage to his native religion while inwardly worshipping the Hebrew God. ¹³ The Hebrew word *Mithyahadhim* later appeared in the *Book of Esther* (ca.400-300 b.c.e.) to describe a mixed group of non-Jews who either worshipped the Hebrew God or actually converted to Judaism. ¹⁴ Others in subsequent centuries who lived with Jewish permission on the fringes of Judaism without

¹¹ Ibid., *Magesians* X, *Smyrnaeans* VI, *Trallians* VI-XI, *Philadelphians* II, III, VI.

¹² For more on the early etiology of 'Judaize' see Louis Israel Newman, *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1925), 1-24.; Paul Lawrence Rose, *Bodin and the Great God of Nature: The Moral and Religious Universe of a Judaizer* (Geneva: Droz, 1980), pp. 5-9; and *Encyclopedia Judaica*, "Judaizers."

¹³ *II Kings*.5 is referring to events in Jewish history that likely occurred between ca. 873 and 842 b.c.e.

¹⁴ While the motive for conversion in the story in *Esther* 8.17 was said to have been fear, the actual result, "living as Jews do (*ioudaizo*, according to the Septuagint)," does not appear to carry a negative connotation.

becoming Jews also fit in this category, and the name by which they are described (Godfearers) seems to imply that the concept was never burdened by negative qualities.¹⁵

This idea of a Judaizer as a non-Jew who lived and worshipped like Jews was turned upside down in burgeoning Christian thought when the term became a pejorative for Jews who refused to stop living as Jews. The crisis provoking this inversion occurred fifteen years or so after the death of Jesus when dispute arose among followers over non-Jewish ‘converts’ and the continuing validity of Jewish law. A council was convened in Jerusalem in ca.51 to adjudicate the issue of whether non-Jewish converts were required to live by Jewish law, or, as Paul and others argued, whether a life in Christ superseded Jewish law and ritual. The ruling of the council, which released non-Jewish followers of Jesus from the necessity of converting to Judaism and adhering to Jewish law, did not quell the ‘Judaizing’ argument, however, nor did it curb the development of implications rising from it.¹⁶

Paul’s *Letter to the Galatians* in ca. 56, for example, criticized the apostle Peter *not* for the specific act of teaching implementation of the law but for the more general act of living as a Jew.¹⁷ In using the Greek adjective *ioudaios* and the adverb *ioudaikos* to make the explicit point that Christians who live ‘Jewishly’ are culpable of Judaizing, Paul also made the implicit point that Jews *qua* Jews, merely by remaining faithful to the Jewish religion and living as Jews do, Judaize (*ioudaizo*). When he used the noun *ioudaismos* to refer to the Jewish religion, it was in the negative context of pointing out that the superseded ‘Jewish’ system of laws and rituals is something altogether different from the Church established by God. After these earliest

¹⁵ For further discussion on ‘God fearers’ see Tessa Rajak, “The Jewish Community and its Boundaries,” *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, edited by Judith Lieu, John North, and Tessa Rajak (London: Routledge Press, 1992), 19-21; Joseph R. Rosenbloom, *Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present* (Jersey City: Ktav Publishers, Inc., 1979) 50-53.

¹⁶ *Acts* 15.

¹⁷ *Galatians* 1.13-14.

descriptors, the adjective ‘Jewish’ (*ioudaios*), both without nouns and joined to nouns, was used some 170 times by subsequent New Testament writers to point out differentiation. Of these, some 145, or 85% , appear in the *Acts of the Apostles* (ca.65) and the *Gospel of John* (ca.90-100) where the term is used primarily, though not exclusively, to distinguish those in opposition to either God, Christ, the apostles, or the gospel of truth.¹⁸ In the same period that *John* was written the adjective *ioudaios* was used in *Revelation* 2.9 and 3.9 to speak of the “Synagogue of Satan,” and the adjective *ioudaikos*, also transliterated as ‘Jewish,’ was joined to “fables” in *Titus* 1.14 to make the claim that Jewish theology is a “turn from truth.”

Some half century after Paul’s first usage and as employed by Ignatius, *ioudaizo* was firmly attached to the wholly negative concept of Christian heresy. Yet, like the original conception of Judaizer, heresy was not construed as negative prior to its theological development in early Christian thought. The Greek word for heresy, *hairesis*, originally referred to the neutral idea of “choice” and, more specifically, as used among Hellenistic philosophers near the end of second century b.c.e., to the choice of a philosophical school of thought such as Stoicism or Platonism.¹⁹ The Christian author of the *Acts of the Apostles* (ca.65) also employed *hairesis* in this neutral manner when he described sects of Sadducees and Pharisees, as well as Christianity itself. Some nine years before Acts was written, however, Paul had already hinted of less neutral implications when he said in *Corinthians I* (ca.54) that “there have to be *hairesis* (schismatic differences) among you to show which of you have God’s approval.” He followed this with a

¹⁸ According to Vine’s *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. See also Thayer’s *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, *ioudaios*, where the commentator says that Jews were looked upon by John “as a body of men hostile to Christianity, with whom he...and all true Christians had nothing in common.” As such, John is said to have ascribed language to Jesus and the apostles “which distinguishes them from Jews, as though the latter sprang from an alien race.” In this context, *ioudaios* is used to distinguish those who hate and oppose Jesus, whether rulers at the time of the crucifixion or otherwise, “since the hatred of these leaders exhibits the hatred of the whole nation towards Jesus.”

¹⁹ See G.R. Boys-Stones, *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), esp. 154-175.

more apparent turn of meaning in *Galatians* some two years later when he placed heresy alongside fornication, idolatry, witchcraft, and other perils to avoid.²⁰ Still, as evidenced by its neutral usage in *Acts* nearly a decade later, that weigh station between the borders of the Greek notion of ‘choosing’ and the Christian notion of ‘evil that must be avoided’ had not yet been cordoned off from its neutral past.

By the time of Ignatius in ca.108 that ambiguity had been resolved and, from that point forward, heresy was depicted as a Satanic invention to destroy Christian truth and all who were involved, whether teachers or listeners, were to be condemned to hell.²¹ Purveyors of heresies were said to be those who diluted the purity of Christian truth by “mix[ing] Jesus Christ with their own poison,” and those who mixed the particular poison of Judaism with the truth of Christianity were described as *Judaizing* “branches of those who killed the Lord of glory, those fighters against God, those murderers of the Lord.”²² Ignatius advances this genealogy of heresy through a series of plant, coin, and tree metaphors designed to illustrate that both Jews and heretics derive from the devil, and that both stand in stark contrast to the children of God. Delicate plants tended by Christ are placed in opposition to evil-producing plants tended by Satan; the true coins of God, stamped with the image of Christ, are placed opposite false coins that are stamped by the image of wickedness; and life-bearing fruit from the tree of God is placed opposite to Christ-killing fruit from the tree of Satan. Within such metaphoric comparisons, those who walk according to “strange opinions,” a phrase used in conjunction with both Jews and heretics, are called “destroyers;” plantings that are not of the Father, also commonly applied, are called “seeds of the

²⁰ References in *Acts* to Sadducees, 5.17; to Pharisees, 15.5; to Christians, 24.5; to Paul, 26.5. Josephus also spoke neutrally of Jewish sects as *haireis* in the same century. *I Corinthians* 11:18, 19; *Galatians* 5:19-21. *Hairetikos* also appears in *Titus* 3.10 in the context of a warning, but the ca.90-105 dating of the letter places it closer to the Ignatian discussion.

²¹ Ignatius, *Ephesians* XVI; *Trallians* X; *Smyrnaeans* VI, VII; *Philadelphians* III.

²² *Ibid.*, *Trallians* VI.1, XI; *Magnesians* VIII, X; *Philadelphians*, VI.

enemy,” and heretics who preach Jewish law but deny Christ are said to be no better than the Jews who killed him.²³

One searches in vain to find sharply defined distinctions on which to hinge categorizing criteria of the heretics under discussion. What is found instead are overlapping labels and characteristics, and a series of descriptions of Jews used to define both heretics in general and ‘Judaizing heretics’ in particular. Clearly, this is not a case of applying shared characteristics but of using already familiar Christian-assigned Jewish traits to describe and define *other* theological enemies. The new enemy is literally damned, in other words, by placing him in the company of one already said to be sufficiently damned. With each subsequent application more is known about the heretic but only at the expense of the enemy-defining Jew. While the case is being made that a Judaizer is a *type* of heretic derived from the tree of ‘Christ-killing’ Jews, for example, the case is also being made that ‘Christ-killing’ Jews have the added attribute of ‘having branched Judaizing heretics.’²⁴ Beyond the points that all descend from what is *not* the tree of life and that Jews are first in the alleged satanic succession of enemies bearing identical characteristics, the only unambiguous distinction here is that Jews, Judaizers, and heretics constitute the category ‘theological enemies of God.

Such comparative defining not only blurs lines that might be drawn to distinguish Jews, Judaizers, and heretics, this idea of genealogical succession assigns Jews the role of prototypical enemy.²⁵ That such defining and assigning appears in what is the first post-apostolic discussion

²³ Ignatius, *Philadelphians* II, III, IV; *Trallians* XI; *Magnesians* V, VIII.

²⁴ Ibid., *Magnesians*, VIII, X; *Philadelphians*, VI; *Trallians*, XI.

²⁵ For technical discussions regarding the problems with categorically distinguishing heretics, Judaizers, and Jews in the Ignatian epistles, see Charles Thomas Brown, *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), 173-203; Christine Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1992); C.K. Barrett, “Jews and Judaizers in the *Epistles of Ignatius*,” in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976), 220-244.

of heresy in the early church is not without significance. As a struggling body emerging from Judaism, the church was deliberately involved in the negation of both Judaism and any 'carry over practice' of that alleged 'Jewish' system of deceptive thought. This purposeful negation, the advancement of Christianity as truth in its stead, and the belief that Jews were not only the first but the lasting enemies of Christianity were thus all key informants in the earliest development of the mutually dependent concepts of 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy.'

That Jews and Judaism were caught on the cusp of this development is illustrated in the first universal council after Christianity was recognized by the Roman Empire some two hundred years later.²⁶ As the first emperor of the Roman Empire to embrace Christianity, Constantine convened the 325 Nicene Council for the dual purpose of quelling the Arian heresy and settling the controversy over the 'Jewish' dating of Easter in the Christian calendar. At the Council's close he issued a letter to all of the churches in Christendom on the second matter. In the context of decreeing that Easter not be observed at the same time as the Passover of Jews, he stressed three different times that it had been universally decided that "we ought not," that "it is our duty not to," that "it is right to demand" that Christians have nothing "in common with the murderers of our Lord." By unanimously adopting the measure of not observing Easter at Passover, both he and the fathers of the council, Constantine explained, wanted to make evident their will "to separate ourselves from the detestable company of the Jews." Even if Jews were not in error on the dating of Easter, he instructed, "it would still be your duty not to tarnish your soul by communication with such wicked people."²⁷

²⁶ Christianity was recognized by the Roman Empire in 311 by Galerius (Edict of Toleration), and in 313 by Constantine and Licinius (Edict of Milan).

²⁷ Arianism held that Christ was not eternal with the father but created by him, and this was taken by the orthodox camp as a denial of Christ's divinity. Constantine, *On the Keeping of Easter*.

While interest in the Nicene Council has traditionally focused on the creation of the first unified creed of Christendom, this unanimous decision to separate Christians from Jews cannot be seen as secondary to those concerned with the conceptual implications of supersessionist theology. Coming from a council convened over heresy, framed in provocative language emphasizing Jewish error, and issued to all of Christendom by the Emperor himself, this letter, like all authoritative declarations from the Church, was not only part of the gathering documentation that would be handed down in succession as evidence of traditional attitudes about Jews, it carried imperial affirmation of those attitudes. Moreover, this conveyance from the hand of the first Christian emperor served as the basis for a body of ecclesiastical anti-Judaizing laws that followed in its wake.

The first order of business for the 341 Council of Antioch, for example, was the Easter decree issued by “Emperor Constantine, beloved of God.”²⁸ According to the canonical response to Constantine’s letter, Christian lay and clergy who persisted in observing Easter at the time of Passover were to be respectively excommunicated and deposed on the grounds that such observance “heaps sin” on the practitioner. Such ‘heaping’ was ruled to be greater in the case of clergy since by example they would be the “cause of destruction and subversion” to others. The Apostolical Canons in ca.325-341 also called for the deposition of bishops, presbyters, or deacons who celebrated Easter at Passover, as well as prohibitions against entering synagogues to pray, accepting food from Jewish festivals, or fasting during those festivals or on Sabbath.²⁹ Such concern was also the focus of the Council of Laodicea (ca.343-381), which ruled that Christians who took the day off from work on Saturdays were to be considered “Judaizers” and “anathema to Christ.” This same council, as well, issued proscriptions against the so-called ‘Judaizing’

²⁸ Council of Antioch, I (ca.341).

²⁹ Apostolic Canons VII, LXIV, LXVI, LXX, LXXI, ca. 325-341.

practices of reading only the Hebrew scriptures on the Jewish Sabbath, attending Jewish feasts, eating food from those feasts, or receiving unleavened bread from Jews.³⁰

Just how these 'Judaizing' acts could heap sin or be the cause of subversion to others is explained through the eternal 'life or death' structure of supercessionist theology. Where it was said that Judaism was 'anathema to Christ,' it meant literally that Judaism had been set aside as divinely cursed and damned. Those who participated in the 'cursed' practice of Judaism were seen as having set themselves on the road to eternal destruction, and those whose task it was to 'save and feed the flocks' were impelled to remind sharply, and often, of this consequential difference between 'false' Judaism and the truth of Christianity.

For John Chrysostom, Bishop of Antioch, later to be named Patriarch of Constantinople, Saint, and Doctor of the Church, this meant a series of anti-Judaizing sermons in ca.386-387 which starkly distinguished between 'life' offered in God-filled churches and 'death' issuing from 'Godless' synagogues. Like Ignatius, whom he followed in the role of bishop as well as in the work of warning against the dangers of 'mixing' Christianity with Jewish 'poison,' he held tenaciously that any Jewish practice made one an enemy of truth. He framed his attack around the metaphor of "serious illness," "the worst madness," and "diseases which are most urgent and acute," and he preached vehemently through a succession of eight sermons that those who thought that Jewish and Christian theology had anything in common were already sick with the "Judaizing disease."³¹ He also primed the long-held Christian claim that "no Jew adores God."³²

His corollary portrait of the Jew as the God-hating collaborator of Satan is honed through thirteen depictions in the first sermon alone: Jews as the welcoming hosts of demons, Jewish

³⁰ Council of Laodicea, XVI, XXIX, XXXVII, XXXVIII, ca.343-381.

³¹ John Chrysostom, *Adversus Judaeos*, I.1.4, 5 and I.IV.1.

³² *Ibid.*, I.1.

synagogues as condemned shrines where Jewish children and "other men's souls" are sacrificed, Jewish souls as the habitats of demons, and Jews themselves as demons.³³ As enemies said to be thoroughly aligned with evil, both hating God and fighting against him, Chrysostom does not hesitate to invoke the Christian duty to hate Jews, nor does he hesitate to urge by personal example, or by that of the martyrs, that this is the proper and sanctified attitude.³⁴ After explicitly teaching that Christians should "hate and avoid," "despise," and "hold in abomination" the synagogue," he defined the obligation of one who loves Christ as "never hav[ing] enough of fighting against those who hate Christ."³⁵ "We must," he directs, "hate both the[Jews] and their synagogue."

This was an image that had been in the making since Ignatius sketched the outline in ca.108 on his way to martyrdom. From Rome, where Justin Martyr taught in ca.135 that devils had instigated Jews to inflict sufferings on Jesus, to North Africa, where Augustine affirmed in early fifth century that Jews were "possessed by devils and devoured," father after father honed the idea of Jewish collusion with Satan to destroy God's plan for humanity.³⁶ The location of this enterprise, "the synagogue of the Jews who fight against God," as expressed by Chrysostom, was more explicitly called the "synagogue of Satan" by Jerome and others, with the common understanding that "up to the present day" it remains the nexus of organization for the Jewish persecution of Jesus and the church.³⁷ Moreover, given that the phrase 'synagogue of Satan' was

³³ Ibid, I.V.I; I.III.2; I.II.4-6; I.III.7; I.VI.4, 8; III.3; I.IV.2, 3; I.VI.2,6, 8; I.VII.5; I.VIII.4.

³⁴ Ibid., I.VII.5, IV.VII.4. "The martyrs have a special hatred for the Jews...[since they] poured out their own blood for him whom the Jews had slain;" VI.1.7.

³⁵ Ibid., I.V.2, 4, 8; VII.1.1. Chrysostom made this statement in the context of the question "Have you had enough of the fight against the Jews?"

³⁶ Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* LXIII; Augustine, *Psalm* 47.

³⁷ Chrysostom, *Adversus* IV.VII.4. See also I. II.5,7; I.III.1; I.IV.1; I.VII.1. See also Jerome, Letters 84, 112, 123, 130.

used by Jerome and others to refer also to churches of heretics, the appellation carried the added implication that the synagogue was the center of an entourage of all types of satanically influenced subversives.³⁸

That Jews served as the prototypical descriptor for heretics was part of this developing picture, as was the layering of various relational claims about Jews and heretics. Tertullian, for example, taught in ca.197 that both Jews and heretics were guilty of the crime of idolatry, that all idolatry is authored by the devil, and that no difference exists between the ‘spirit’ which informs idolatry and the spirit that informs heresy since both are the result of demonic revolt against God.³⁹ Athanasius also used a description of Jews who “persisted in their ignorance [until] death came upon them” to describe heretics who refused to understand the truth of the scriptures.⁴⁰ The specific beliefs of Jews were also used as designators of heretics. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria from 323 to 373 and later canonized as Saint and Doctor of the Church, taught that both Jews and heretical Arians who believed that Jesus was of God but not one and the same as God, “inherited their mad enmity against Christ from their father the devil.” He also colored in the complementary notions that God turns his face from both Jews and Arians, that both act according “to their own evil disposition” and, that with Jewish malignity,” they both go about “Judaizing.”⁴¹ Basil, bishop at Caesarea from 370 to 379, also Saint and Doctor of the Church, then described the heresy Sabellianism as “Judaism being imported under the appearance of Christianity.” He likened those who followed this movement as “belonging to the faction of the

³⁸ Ibid., I.I.5, re Anomoean heresy. See also Jerome, Letters LXX and LXXV in reference to Jews, CXXIII to heretics. Rogatianus of Nova, VII Council of Carthage (258), “On the Baptism of Heretics.” Victorinus, Bishop of Poetovio (ca.270), “Commentary on the Apocalypse of the blessed John” in reference to Jews.

³⁹ Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews I* and *Prescription Against Heretics* XL, where he also taught that “the devil imitated the well known moroseness of the Jewish law.”

⁴⁰ Athanasius, *Letter XIX*.

⁴¹ Athanasius, *On the Opinion of Dionysius; Letter XI; De Decretis* 1-2.

Jews,” adding at another time that he “shudder[s]” at such heresy as much as he does “at Judaism.” In yet a fourth instance he underscored what was previously said by emphasizing that “no one could be wrong in declaring this heresy ...a corrupt Judaism.”⁴² Chrysostom added in 386 that yet another heresy, Anomoeism, was also “akin to that of the Jews.”⁴³

Heretics were aligned with Jews indirectly when the fathers pointed out ‘erroneous’ belief patterns previously attributed to Jews. Ignatius taught, for example, that any who doubted that Christ was born of a virgin, that his blood was shed for the salvation of the world, or that he was raised from the dead, all of which Jews denied, were heretical enemies of the church.⁴⁴ Other Christian claims commonly made against Jews - reliance on endless genealogies, defense of circumcision, denial of the resurrection, and refusal to think that Jesus is the son of God - were included with what Tertullian referred to in ca.197 as ‘properties of heretics.’⁴⁵

Another method of associating heretics with Jews appeared in 378 in the form of a heresiology entitled *Panarian*, which depicted Judaism as the most prolific of five ‘mothers’ of heresy. Making good use of the disease metaphor some eight years before Chrysostom, Epiphanius, the Bishop of Salamis, framed this much-heralded work around the understanding that Christianity was the only cure for the “madness” that was “destroying humanity.” He arranged his descriptive work genealogically, treating the five ‘mothers’ of heresy - Barbarism, Sythianism, Hellenism, Judaism, and Samaritanism - as the five roots of a tree from which some

⁴² Basil, *Letter CCX*, referring to Sabellianism; *CCXXVI, CLXXXIX*, applied both to Sabellianism and Arianism; *CCLXI*, to Marcellus.

⁴³ Chrysostom, *Adversus Iudaeos*, I.1.5 referring to the Anomoean heresy, which like Eunomianism, Semiarianism, Exocotianism, and Acacianism were offshoots of Arianism.

⁴⁴ Ignatius, *Trallians X, Magnesians XI., Smyrnaeans VI,VII.*

⁴⁵ Tertullian, *Prescription XXXIII*. Kenneth Stow, *Alienate Minority*, 31, says the exegete Rabanus Maurus (776-856) taught that “anyone who corrupts Christian doctrine is one who teaches a doctrine resembling that of Jews.”

eighty heresies branched.⁴⁶ Of these, roughly seventy five percent can be shown to derive in one way or another from Judaism, a claim not made explicitly, but wholly implicit in the genealogical demonstrations and accompanying descriptions that classified various heresies and heretics as, for example, “a type of Jew,” “Jews with gospels,” “uses Jewish law,” “defends Jews,” “holds Jewish views of everything but circumcision and Sabbath.”⁴⁷

A series of denunciations required of Jews converting to Christianity, in approximately the same period, appears to substantiate that Jews were not only strongly associated with the idea of heresy but at least in this case deemed heretical and set aside as damned.

I place under anathema the heresies among the Jews, and the heretics themselves. I anathematize the Sadducees...the Pharisees.. the Nazareans...the Osseans...the Herodians...the Hemerobaptists... the Scribes... Together with all these Jewish heresies and heresiarchs, deuteroses and givers thereof, I anathematize those who celebrate the feast of Mordecai on the first sabbath of the Christian fast... Together with the ancients, I anathematize also the Chief Rabbis and new evil doctors of the Jews...⁴⁸

Heretics were also labeled by the same non-human metaphors as Jews. Some three decades after Ignatius compared the behavior of all those who “hold opinions contrary to the doctrine of Christ” as “ravening dogs who bite secretly,” Justin Martyr applied the dog metaphor specifically to Jews by teaching that God himself referred to Jews as dogs when he ‘predicted’ in

⁴⁶ Epiphanius, *Panarian*, VII.5.4, speaking generally about heresy and specifically about antidicomarianism, which rejected the virgin birth of Mary.

⁴⁷ The ‘mothers’ and their offspring are divided into two specific ‘types,’ those invented by people and those that take their point of departure from sacred scripture. Percentages of those said to derive from Judaism can vary depending on how these categories are tabulated. Barbarianism and Scythism are each described as a single entity, but Hellenism is described as having 5 sects, Judaism as having 7, and Samaritanism as having 4. The greater majority of heresies are said to have branched from distortions of scripture, meaning that they derived from either Judaism or Samaritanism, with the understanding that Samaritanism splintered from Judaism. Christianity, also a splinter from Judaism, is said to have branched 60 heretical sects, many of which are said to have ‘Jewish’ qualities. For examples of heretics and heresies being described according to ‘Jewish’ traits, see discussions on Basalides, Cerinthians, Paul of Samosota, Essenes, Ossaeans, Sampsaeanes, Antidicomarians, Heracleonites, Audians, and Anomoeans.

⁴⁸ English translation in James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism* (New York: Atheneum, 1977), A3, 398-400.

Psalms that the “synagogue of the wicked” would condemn him.⁴⁹ Epiphanius used the same metaphor in 378 to describe Antidicomarian heretics as “new Jews” who, like their predecessors, behave like “mad dogs” and turn on their master, and in the same period Chrysostom preached that Jews fostered kinship with dogs before being turned into dogs themselves.⁵⁰ An even more provocative illustration of the ‘Jew as dog’ is found in a fifth century Byzantine Good Friday participatory liturgy, which calls for Christians to audibly respond: “A destructive band of Godforsaken wicked murders of God, the synagogue attacked you, O Christ... like a pack of dogs they surrounded you.”⁵¹

Heretics were aligned with Jews in yet another critical way.. In his *Epistle to the Philadelphians* Ignatius put forth the idea that those Christians who exhibit certain Jewish behaviors, such as preaching Jewish law while denying that Christ is the Son of God, are “Jew[s] falsely-called”⁵² Subsequent church fathers adopted a more direct epithet, calling heretics “the new Jews” to make the same denunciatory point. The fourth century church historian Eusebius charged his Christian theological opponent with ‘being a Jew,’⁵³ for example, while Athanasius attributed demonic enmity for Christ to “both the Jews of that day and the new Jews of the present day,” by which he meant Arian heretics. Athanasius also portrayed Jews as colluding with these ‘new Jews,’ the “Arian madmen,” to defile, sack, and burn the church at Alexandria and

⁴⁹ Ignatius, *Ephesians*, VII; Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, CIV.

⁵⁰ Epiphanius, *Panarian*, “Against Antidocomarians, 3.7-4.5. Chrysostom, *Adversus I.II.1-2.*; the reference is to *Philippians* 3:2-3 where ‘mutilation’ is used to refer to circumcision but with no direct reference to Jews.

⁵¹ See Paul Halsall, *Medieval Sourcebook*, Canticle 9, for the full text of the Byzantine liturgy. The Jew as dog concept was so prolific in the Middle Ages that it has provided material for a book on the subject by Kenneth Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and its Interpreters* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

⁵² Ignatius, *Philadelphians* VI.

⁵³ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastica Theologica* II, 2-3.

depose the orthodox bishop in favor of an Arian.⁵⁴ In the same period, Epiphanius described Antidicomarian heretics by comparing them with Jews who crucified Christ, calling these “new Jews” their “successors.”⁵⁵ Others employing this epithet included Severus, Patriarch of Antioch in the early sixth century, who denounced the “madness” of his theological opponents by declaring to his congregation that these “new Jews” were synonymous with Jews.⁵⁶ He also taught of the “Jewish character” and “poisonous doctrines” of the alleged heretic Nestorius, who was condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431 but whose followers were said to have carried the heresy forward.⁵⁷ The late sixth century church historian Evagrius likewise described Nestorian heretics as “the tongue that fought God, the second Sanhedrin of Caiphus” in his *Ecclesiastical History* as did, according to Evagrius’ translator, Michael Whitby, Socrates and Theodoret.⁵⁸ Moreover, says Whitby, it was not only the orthodox who were flinging the epithets: Nestorians whom the orthodox called heretics were also attempting to damage the orthodox by calling them “the new Jews.”⁵⁹

Informing all of these comparisons, definitions, and labels was the belief that Jews, whether ‘old’ or ‘new,’ surreptitiously subverted the church. One of the ways, and perhaps the

⁵⁴ Athanasius, *On the Opinion of Dionysius*, 3, and *Circular Letter 2.7*, in which he pleads with churchmen to avenge the “Arian madmen” who had taken over his bishopric in Alexandria by sending a body of Jews and heathens to attack church congregations with swords and clubs. The church was said to have been set on fire, “virgins” stripped naked, monks trampled under foot, “hurled headlong and beaten with swords and clubs, and “Jews, the murderers of our Lord,” along with “godless heathen,” then stripped themselves naked and performed “acts too shameful to relate.”

⁵⁵ Epiphanius, VII.4.5.

⁵⁶ *Severus of Antioch*, Pauline Allen and C.T.R. Hayward, trans. (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 12, 15. Severus taught that Jews were “synonymous” with the heresy of Chalcedon.

⁵⁷ Severus, *Philatethes*, florilegium (p.71 in Allen and Hayward); *Contra impium Grammaticum*, Or.III.14 and 23 (pp.91-93); *Text 16, Homily XVIII* (pp.119-120).

⁵⁸ Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, II.2, trans. Michael Whitby. Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 31, says that Pope Adrian I (772-795) also referred to Byzantine iconoclast heretics as Jews.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 7. Whitby cites Socrates (II,19), Theodoret (I,4,5), and *The Life of Severus*, a work attributed to Athanasius, in which Chalcedonian heretics were called “new Jews.”

most feared way, in which this was said to be achieved was through the process of causing Christians to *become* Jews. Basil was sufficiently concerned about such possibility in the fourth century to caution that, if allowed to continue his teachings, the heretic Apollonarius will cause the church to be “altogether turned from Christians into Jews.”⁶⁰ Jerome, too, in a letter to Augustine a few decades later, insisted that Jewish converts could cause the same destructive transformation. If Jews converting to Christianity continued the ceremonies they practiced “in the synagogues of Satan,” he advised, they “will not become Christians, but will make us Jews.” His concern, like that of all the fathers, centered around the belief that all Jewish ceremonies were so “hurtful and fatal...that whoever observed them” would join the Jews in “the pit of perdition.”⁶¹

Lines between Jews and heretics were blurred in non-ecclesiastical ways as well. After declaring toleration of Christianity in 313, Emperor Constantine issued a law of “deserved punishment” in 315 for any who joined the “nefarious sect” of the Jews.⁶² This slant of language, as well as that of his 325 Nicene letter that attributed to “detestable” and “wicked” Jews “the most fearful of crimes,” was adopted by later Christian emperors who used similar terminology in imperial legislation to describe the ‘criminal’ activities of both Jews and heretics. In 380, some six years before Chrysostom joined Epiphanius in imprinting the disease metaphor on the fourth century, Emperor Theodosius I declared Christianity the official religion of the empire, labeling any who chose *not* to follow it as “demented and insane.” Those so afflicted were to be (metaphorically) “branded with the ignominious name of heretics.” Terminology applied thereafter to heretics included not only ‘nefarious’ and ‘wicked,’ previously used to describe

⁶⁰ Basil, *Letter CCLXIII*. Basil was referring to Apollonarius.

⁶¹ Jerome, *Letter LXXV* to Augustine, 404 ce.

⁶² *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmonian Constitutions*, translated by Clyde Pharr, in collaboration with Theresa Sherrer Davidson and Mary Brown Pharr (London & Princeton: Oxford University Press and Princeton University Press, 1952), hereafter CTh, 16.8.1.

Jews, but also a coterie of terms common to the disease metaphor employed by the church fathers.⁶³ Words such as “madness,” “poison,” “contaminate,” “noxious,” “pernicious,” and “contagious” appeared regularly in laws applying to heretics,⁶⁴ while laws stating or implying application to both Jews and heretics were framed around phrases such as “pestilence and contagion,” “attempts to pollute,” and “contaminated by the contagious presence of the criminals.”⁶⁵ Heretics were also described in terms of being deeply rooted in evil, as being “perfidious,” “disturbing the world” with “false doctrines,” and subverting and violating the divine institution of the church, all of which were common ideas espoused by church fathers about Jews.⁶⁶

Beginning around 388 and continuing through the 438 validation of the Theodosian Code, laws contained more and more inclusive yet ambiguous language. Laws against heretics used phraseology such as “all members of diverse and perfidious sects who are driven by the insanity of a miserable conspiracy against God,” “no person who disagrees [with us] in faith and religion,” “persons who attempt anything contrary and opposed to the Catholic sect,” and “all men who resort to their own rites of heretical superstition,” while combined laws against Jews and heretics referred to those who “wish to throw into confusion the sacraments of the Catholic faith.”⁶⁷ To add to the confusion Jews and pagans were named together in legislation with heretics as “others in error who cannot be converted to the worship of the Catholic

⁶³ CTh.16.1.2, translation by Henry Bettensen, *Documents of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), 31.

⁶⁴ CTh. 16.5.2, 6.1, 9.1, 24, 25, 26, 31, 55.

⁶⁵ CTh.16.5.44, 62; 16.8.22.

⁶⁶ CTh.16.5.15, 18, 19, 21, 25, 34, 37, 41.

⁶⁷ CTh..16.5.15, 42, 47, 56, and Cth.16.5.46. Such descriptive terminology was rarely applied to pagans. See the 438 Novella entitled “Jews, Heretics, and Pagans” for an important exception.

communion.”⁶⁸ One law against what was said to be an especially noxious heresy (Caelicolism) was condemned on the grounds that followers “compel[led] Christians to assume the detestable and offensive name of Jews.” Those who called themselves by this name were to be “held guilty of the crime of high treason” for attempting to persuade Christians to “adopt a perversity that is Jewish and alien to the Roman Empire.” The harsh penalty was explained by saying it would be “more grievous than death and more cruel than murder [if] any person of the Christian faith should be polluted by Jewish disbelief.”⁶⁹

Later laws, under the category “Jews,” spoke of “Jewish stigma,” “attempt to pollute,” and “perversity of this race,” while others, under the category “Heretics,” more inclusively referred to “all false doctrines inimical to the Catholic Faith” and “all whose sects it disgusts us to insert in our most pious sanction, all of whom have different names but the same perfidy.”⁷⁰ As if to further ambiguity still, Jews, Samaritans, heretics, and even pagans were eventually joined under one categorical heading in a 438 law as those “demented [and] damned” folks who posed contradictions to the Roman Empire’s “ceremonies of sanctity.” All were said to “spread” into the life of the Roman people “like an indistinguishable confusion.”⁷¹

By 438, if not before, it was clear that whatever it was to be an enemy of God under Christian emperors it was also to be an enemy of the state. As a group, ‘enemies of God’ were said to wreck havoc upon both the divine institutions of church and state, yet, as evidenced by attempts to address Jews, heretics, and pagans under separate headings in the Theodosian Code, some distinctions were clearly intended. Perhaps the most crucial for this study, and one that

⁶⁸ CTh.16.5.44.

⁶⁹ CTh.16.8.19. The full heading of Title 8 of the *Theodosian Code* is “Jews, Caelicolists, and Samaritans.”

⁷⁰ CTh 16.8.14, 22 and 16.5.60, 62, 63.

⁷¹ NTh.3.

remains untouched by cross-categorical overlapping, is that pagans were perceived as those who *ignored* God by refusing to acknowledge and embark on the path of ‘truth,’ while Jews and heretics were perceived as those ‘falsely’ claiming to be on the monotheistic path. In this critical sense, Jews and heretics “weaken[ed the concept of God]” in ways that pagans did not.⁷²

Yet, like claims against Jews in the writings of church fathers, claims against Jews in the Theodosian Code appear before claims against heretical and pagan enemies. Legislation against Jews began as early as 315 while laws against heretics and pagans did not appear until 326 and 341 respectively. Jews were also the first of ‘God’s enemies’ subjected to capital punishment for religious matters. As early as 315 Jews attempting to assail those who converted from Judaism to Christianity were to be “immediately delivered to the flames and burned, [along] with accomplices.”⁷³ Heresy, on the other hand, was not proclaimed a capital crime until 382. Moreover, Jews were distinguished by being assigned lead position in the title of the 438 law, “Jews, Heretics, and Pagans,” which placed the ‘enemies of God’ into one category of treatment. While this order first appears misrepresentative when considering the number of laws issued against heretics (66), Jews (34), and pagans (25), a close reading of the laws pertaining to heretics reveals that 31 of 66 make specific references to five heresies associated with Jews. Some forty seven percent of laws against heretics thus address heresies that were linked to Jews by the Code itself or through the writings of the church fathers and laws of the councils, or both.⁷⁴ It is also significant that of the thirty one laws pertaining to heresies ‘tainted’ with Jewish influence, some

⁷² CTh.16.5.5; quotation was used in reference to heretics. See also CTh.16.5.44, 46.

⁷³ CTh 16.8.1.

⁷⁴ Laws pertaining to Eunomians and Arians: 16.5.8 (7/381); 5.11 (7/383); 5.12 (12/383); 5.13 (1/384); 5.59 (4/423). To Apollinarians: 16.5.12 (12/383); 5.13 (1/384); 5.14 (3/388); 5.33 (4/397). To Eunomians: 16.5.17 (5/389); 5.31 (4/396); 5.32 (4/396); 5.34 (3/398); 5.36 (7/399); 5.58 (11/415). To Arians: 16.5.16 (3/388). To Arians, Apollinarians, Sabbatians, Eunomians, Donatists: 16.5.65 (8/435). To Donatists: 16.5.37 (2/405); 5.38 (2/405); 5.39 (12/405); 5.40 (2/407); 5.41 (11/407); 5.43 (11/408); 5.44 (11/408); 5.46 (1/409); 5.52 (1/413); 5.54 (6/414). To Sabbatians: 16.5.59 (4/423).

eighty seven percent were issued in the period between 388 and 438 when the language of the laws was becoming more and more inclusively ambiguous.

All heresies and paganisms in the Roman Empire were eventually outlawed while Judaism was allowed to exist, but this is not evidence in itself of imperial benevolence toward Jews. The metaphysical and theological tenets of Christianity required the continued existence of Judaism, and such requirement figured necessarily in legal decisions about both the continuing existence of Judaism and the conditions under which Jews existed in the Christian state. God's plan for humanity, as set forth in Christian doctrine, involved the conversion of all peoples to Christianity, including Jews. Yet conversion of Jews, more than that of any other people, was central to Christian doctrine, for it was to herald the second coming of Christ and signal the onset of his thousand-year earthly reign. Moreover, the Christian church and state were metaphysically constrained to disallow extinction of Jews and Judaism because of their dual theological role as witness to Jewish inequity and Christian truth. While uncooperative pagans and unrepentant heretics could be extinguished, Judaism and Jews were thus tolerated, though never as a sanctified religion, and always in the category 'God's enemy.' The only Jews said to be exempt from this category were those who had fled Judaism for Christianity and "resorted to the worship of God."⁷⁵ Jews who were not unequivocally for God's truth - as 'truth' was understood in the writings of mainstream Christianity and secular law under Christian emperors - remained in the category 'God's enemy,' the subdivisions of which continued to be atheists (pagans) and 'false believers' (Jews and heretics).

Yet like the category 'truth,' the category 'God's enemy' had shifting boundaries in those days. Arians, who called themselves Christians but were judged 'heretics' by the orthodox party, for example, were exiled and then defended by Emperor Constantine (307-337), hated by

⁷⁵ CTh 16.8.1.

Constans (337-350), supported by Constantius II (337-361), tolerated under Julian (361-363), supported then opposed by Valentinian I (364-375), loved by Valens (364-378), protected then opposed by Valentinian II (375-392), and strongly opposed by the fiercely orthodox rule of Theodosius I (379-395). Athanasius, on the other hand, the leading orthodox contender against Arianism from its inception in 318 until his death in 373, was deposed from his Alexandrian bishopric in favor of Arian opponents no less than five different times between 335 and 366, some seventeen out of thirty one years. This meant that Arianism, the view that Jesus was *not* God, was deemed the ‘true’ view of God’s nature each time Athanasius was exiled while the view that Jesus is God, which Athanasius defended and is today embraced by western Christendom, was deemed heretical.⁷⁶

This changing tide in which the enemy today could be God’s friend tomorrow, however, was in no way unique to Athanasius, Alexandria, or Arianism. While Arianism was indeed the most challenging, persistent, and perhaps most viciously battled heresy, the general *tumult* about what was or was not Christian truth (and what was or was not therefore heresy) was a constant fixture of the ancient church. The instability of early Christian doctrine, the misunderstood, changing, and contested boundaries of who and what was heretical, along with the complications of perceiving and being perceived the righteous one minute and the devil the next, could do no more than confound an already existing conceptual confusion about who, of those who called themselves Christian, constituted the category ‘God’s enemy.’

The absence of a corollary confusion about the Jew as ‘God’s enemy’ is part of this consideration. As the only ‘false-believing theological enemy’ necessarily related to the Christian message - one might say indispensably related - Jews remained the *only* constant constituent

⁷⁶ According to the dating of W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), Athanasius was deposed from 335 to 337, 339 to 346, 356 to 362, 363 to 364, and 365 to 366.

according to all parties, both orthodox and heretical, and in all periods of truth-defining and enemy-defining conflicts. Moreover, the persistent linking of ‘Jewish thought’ by church fathers to what can arguably be called the nine major non-gnostic heretical movements plaguing the doctrinal stability of the church between the second and sixth centuries could only have increased the weight of the idea that wherever enemy assaults against truth existed so did the Jew.⁷⁷

Such implication is especially apparent in the continuing development of the concept Judaizer. While not every heretic was labeled a ‘Judaier,’ every ‘Judaizer’ was clearly labeled a heretic, and it is here at this critical juncture where lines between Jews, Judaizers, and heretics are most blurred. An important case in point can be found in the collections of ecclesiastical and secular laws in the early Middle Ages. The first systematic collection of canon laws in western Christendom appeared in France in ca.586-627 under the title *Collectio Vetur Gallica*, spread through Germany and Northern Italy in two eighth and ninth century revisions, carrying with them an official curse, or anathema, on Christian ‘Judaizers’ who rested on the Sabbath.⁷⁸ In roughly the same period in Spain, a series of rulings, which were both anti-Jewish and anti-Judaizing, were passed by the Council of Toledo IV in 633 and subsequently made part of a highly influential collection of laws that circulated under the title *Collectio Hispania* (ca.633-636).⁷⁹ One of those laws decreed that Christians who accepted gifts from Jews were “defender[s] of the enemies of Christ” since they encouraged “the perfidy of those who are known...to be

⁷⁷ Doetists, for example, were linked to Jews by Ignatius; Arians by Athanasius and Basil; Anomoeans by Chrysostom; Ebionites by Jerome; Apollonarians and Sabellians by Basil; Chalcedonians and Nestorians by Severus of Antioch and Evagrius; Donatists by the Theodosian Code. Ebionites were not as pervasive and “major” in the same way that Arianism was, yet the movement persisted through subsequent centuries.

⁷⁸ *Collectio Vetus Gallica* was probably compiled in Lyons and revised in Autun (ca.663-680) and Corbie (early to mid 8th century). L.568-572.

⁷⁹ *Collectio Hispania* appears in three recensions: *Isidoreana* (ca.633-636); *Juliana* (ca.681); *Vulgata* (ca.694-702), both of which are dependent on the first.L.571-572.

members of Antichrist's body.”⁸⁰ Another forbade association with the corrupted Jewish ‘enemy,’ on the grounds that people “prone to sin” caused Christian corruption. Coupled with these laws in *Collectio Hispania* was the anathema of Christian ‘Judaizers’ who rested on Saturdays, as well as prohibitions against other assaults on truth, such as celebrating holidays with Jews or accepting their unleavened bread.⁸¹ A systematic index of this collection, along with summaries of the laws, was then put into circulation under the separate title *Collectio Hispania Excerpta* (ca.656-666), carrying with it not only prohibitions against ‘Christian Judaizing’ but also an explicit decree against ‘Jews Judaizing’ through the purchase of Christian slaves.⁸² Both collections, *Hispania* and *Excerpta*, were then reproduced in *Collectio Hispana Systematica* and diffused north of the Pyrenees in ca.675-681, as evidenced by eighth century Gallic manuscripts. Another collection composed in Gaul in the second half of the eighth century, *Herovallian*, also carried an antiJudaizing law, the application of which was in direct reference to “those who become Christians from Jews.”⁸³

Other Judaizing connotations were being transmitted through Visigothic legislation. The first codex of Visigoth laws in ca.654 carried seventeen decrees under the joint title ‘Jews and Heretics,’ only two of which pertained directly to heresies. Of the fifteen pertaining to Jews, four had been in existence prior to the 654 codex, and one of those, promulgated as early as a decade before, decreed a “most degrading death” to ‘Judaizing Christians’ who perpetrated the “horrendous and execrable evil” of practicing Jewish rites.⁸⁴ It must be pointed out, however, that Visigoth Jewry law was not wholly secular. Each of the three promulgations of the Visigoth laws

⁸⁰ Toledo IV, under Bishop Isidore of Seville in 633, Canons 58, 62; L.485-491.

⁸¹ *Collectio Hispania* included Canons 29, 37, 38 from the Council of Laodicea; L571-573; 485.

⁸² *Collectio Hispania Excerpta*, Canons 9.1.2 and 9.5.2; L580-585.

⁸³ *Collectio Hispania Systematica*, L585-589; *Collectio Herovallian*, Aera 39, L596.

⁸⁴ The Visigoth law “On Judaizing Christians,” 12.2.16, is attributed to King Chindasvinth (642-653).

was in conjunction with or mutually dependent upon a Toledo church council (Toledo VIII, 653; XII, 681, and XVI, 693) and informed or upheld by four additional councils (Toledo III, 589; IV, 633; VI, 638; and XVII, 694). This reciprocal relation between the two highest authorities of the land in disseminating the Judaizing concept is important not only for the obvious reasons, but because it documents the development of the Judaizing concept in a set of conditions different than those previously discussed. In contrast to the Christianized Roman Empire, where Judaism was allowed to exist as a tolerated religion, Judaism became completely outlawed in the Christianized Visigoth kingdom.

Visigoths were originally Arian Christians who were led to a “statewide and state-controlled conversion” to Catholicism by King Reccared (588-601) in 589.⁸⁵ In 613 King Sisebut (612-621) then decreed that Jews were to be included in this statewide orthodox unity through forced conversion. The Council of Toledo IV (633), however, convoked by King Sisenand (631-636) and directed by Isidore of Seville, opposed forced baptism of Jews but insisted that those who had been forced must now be forced to remain Christian.⁸⁶ By 638 Pope Honorious (625-638) was sufficiently concerned that the Toledo IV ruling was not being enforced that he appealed by letter to the Council of Toledo VI (638) “to do its duty” and uphold the sanctified status of baptized Jews. As interpreted by King Chintila (636-639), the ‘duty’ called for by the Pope was not *just* to force baptized Jews to remain Christian but to “eradicate entirely the prevarications and superstitions” of Jews.⁸⁷ Indeed, he had already devised and administered *en masse* a required oath intended to break the “inflexible perfidy” of Jews some thirty days before he convened Toledo VI. In affirmation of Chintila’s measures, the fathers of Toledo VI

⁸⁵ Conversion of the Visigoths from Arianism to Catholicism was formalized by Toledo III in 589.

⁸⁶ Council of Toledo IV, L485-6.

⁸⁷ L491-2.

reestablished the forced baptism policy of 613, reaffirmed the antiJewish and antiJudaizing laws of Toledo IV, and adopted as canonical Chintila's oath, which forced Jews to swear to "reject, abominate, and execrate the Jewish rite," "despise and abominate [Jewish] places of prayer," and "stone [to death] any who perpetrated the crime [of returning to Jewish practices]." ⁸⁸

When newly ascended King Reccesvinth (653-672) convoked Toledo VIII (Dec.653), just months before he promulgated the first codex of Visigoth laws, the only religious problem in the Visigoth kingdom, he said, was "the life style and customs of the Jews ,whose pestilential contagion still pollutes the land under my new rule." ⁸⁹ After urging the Council to reform the "vile sacrilege" of Jews or destroy it by punishment, the fathers reaffirmed the antiJewish and antiJudaizing canons of Toledo IV, reasserted the principle of Catholic Visigoth unity, decreed that rulers of the Visigoth kingdom "protect it from the menace of [Jewish] perfidy and the outrage of all heresies," and denounced the "deplorable nation" of the Jews. ⁹⁰ Reccesvinth's promulgation of the first Visigoth civil code three months later included fifteen Jewry laws that were intended to extirpate "the shoots of heresies from their roots" by systematically outlawing Judaism and forbidding, on penalty of death, Christian defense of protection of non-compliant Jews. Along with the new laws, the old anti-Judaizing law that sentenced to death those Christians who dared to practice any rite of Judaism was reissued, and both old and new were prefaced by an unmistakable linking of Jews and Jewish influence (the roots) to Christian heresy (the new shoots). ⁹¹

⁸⁸ "The Declaration and Oath of the Jews of the City of Toledo," administered December 1, 637 and adopted by Toledo VI after it convened on January 9, 638; L494-500.

⁸⁹ Council of Toledo VIII, L500; *Sancti Spiritus Admirabili Dono*, L 501-2.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, Toledo VIII, *Sancti Spiritus Admirabili Dono*; Canon 10; L502-503.

⁹¹ Codex of Reccesvinth, "Promulgation of the Laws Given and Confirmed on the Jews," and 12.2.3-12.2.11, 12.2.15; L261-262, 277-280. Eight of the eleven new laws explicitly forbade circumcision, all Jewish holidays and Sabbath, all food laws, and all marriage rites and customs. "On Judaizing Christians"

That Reccesvinth's Code did not achieve extirpation of Judaism is evidenced by a second promulgation of Visigoth Jewry laws in October 680. Immediately after his ascension to the throne, but before consulting a church council, King Erviga (680-687) constructed and issued a second set of laws to complement the first, on the grounds that "the perfidious deceit of the Jewish deviation often turns more vehemently callous in crime the more frequently it strives to oppose the laws instituted against it." Three months later, he urged the fathers of Toledo XII to accept his laws as the means to "eradicate from its roots the plague of the Jews which always breaks out in new madness." The fathers responded to his request to "promulgate a combined resolution against the crimes of those perfidious men" by adopting as canon law *in exactly the same order* each of the twenty eight Jewry laws that he had just been promulgated in his Visigoth civil codex.⁹²

When Judaizing practices were still not contained some twelve years later, King Egica (687-702) convoked the Council of Toledo XVI (May 693) and presented as the most important business the need to "crush entirely...the doomed perfidy of the Jews." He urged the Council to assure conversion of Jews or "consistently punish [them] by harsher pains" of legal measures, including prohibiting Jews who were not "entirely Christian" from all economic commerce with Christians.⁹³ Whether or not the Council fathers were moved by the question the King suggested

was also reissued, as were three earlier laws on Jewish ownership of slaves. Tying together the composite of measures was yet another oath of fidelity to Christianity, required of all Jews. "Oath of the Jews in the Name of the Prince (12.2.17)" was administered on 1 January 654, one month after the close of Toledo VIII.

⁹² Code of Erviga, 12.3, is a "confirmation" of 12.2. In lieu of the death penalty Judaizers are "shorn of hair, flogged a hundred lashes, put in chains and crushed in the adversity of perpetual exile;" L284-332. See Erviga's address to the Council of Toledo XII, L515-517; also Codex of Erviga, 12.3.1, L287-291. Erviga's laws were adopted by Toledo XII as Canon 9; ecclesiastical promulgation took place on January 27, 681, three days after the Council's close; L517-521; 259-332.

⁹³ Ibid., Toledo XVI, Canon 1, "On the Perfidy of the Jews," L527-529. See also Visigoth law 12.2.18, which forbade Jews to conduct business with Christians until they had proven that they were "entirely Christian" by reciting the Lord's prayer and eating "the food of Christians;" L281-284.

they ask God - “*Should I not hate them, O Lord, that hate thee...?*”- their unanimous decision to affirm his harsh economic measure, as well as reaffirm all previous Jewry laws, was sealed with the Council promise that all of the laws would be “assiduously applied...[with] even greater fervor.” The crushing severity of this combined state and church effort to extirpate “the shoots of heresy” by outlawing Judaism and all alleged Judaizing activities, by requiring and enforcing conversion to Christianity, and by creating a system of informants to report those in noncompliance, cannot be appreciated by reading only titles and summaries alone. Nor can it be grasped the degree to which Jews themselves, by virtue of believing in Judaism rather than Christianity, are characterized as criminal and evil in this code of law that was, until the early twelfth century, the “most influential written law in most parts of Western Europe.”⁹⁴

In other parts of Christendom attempts were also being made to destroy the ‘wickedness’ of Jewish influence. Where the Visigoth state and church attempted to do so by outlawing Judaism and forcibly converting Jews to the light of Christ, the Church elsewhere clung to the theological necessity of tolerating Judaism while tightening what were said to be justified measures of holding Jews in subjection to Christian dominion. Within this theological framework Christians were exhorted to remain separated from these “enemies of God,” as phrased by Pope Stephen III (758-772) when he warned against allowing “communion between light and darkness.”⁹⁵ Christians who did not maintain strict separation from Jews were separated from the Church by excommunication and anathema. Christians who showed favor or support of Jews, as illustrated by the Council of Meaux-Paris in 845-846, were separated from the ‘body of Christ’

⁹⁴ L257-59. Laws were promulgated against the alleged “deviations of the Jews,” “crimes of the Jews,” “perfidy of the Jews,” “wickedness of the Jews” for what was clearly stated to be the explicit purpose of “destroy[ing] the head of wickedness,” as in, for example, 12.2.1, 12.3.1, 12.3.5; L287-294.

⁹⁵ Stephen III, *Convenit Nobis Qui Clavem*, To Aribert, Archbishop of Narbonne, and all Rulers of Septimania and Spain, November 602, L.443-445, and Council of Meaux-Paris (845-46), Canon 74; L.539-548.

and labeled as ‘defenders of the enemies of Christ.’⁹⁶ And, in at least one case before the First Crusade, Jews were separated from Christians when Pope Leo VII ordered the Archbishop of Mainz in ca.937 to expel Jews who refused to believe in Christianity, on the grounds that Christians “are not to have fellowship with God’s enemies.”⁹⁷

That separation continued to be both solution and penalty for Christian association with Jews is evidenced by two authoritative collections of canon laws, the western *Decretum* of Chartres (1094-1095) and the twelfth century Byzantine *Tripartite Commentary to the Conciliar Legislation*. As described in these widely diffused and influential texts, having fellowship with the ‘enemy’ could come about in one of three general ways: actual or perceived association with Jews, mimicking and spreading of Jewishness by adhering to Jewish rites, or supporting and favoring Jews. Any of the singular offences addressed in the prohibiting canons - sharing in Jewish beliefs, fasts, or celebrations; receiving gifts, unleavened bread, or medical treatment from Jews; public bathing with Jews; resting on Saturday or working on Sunday; defending, showing favor, helping, or associating with Jews “in any other way” - constituted a violation severe enough to be anathematized and separated from “the Kingdom of God.”⁹⁸ As a preventative

⁹⁶ Even royalty was not immune from the charge of defending Jews. When German Emperor Otto I imposed a stiff fine on a cleric for killing a Jew in 965, he was accused by Rutherford, bishop of Verona, of being “worse than the Jews,” for “he who loves the Jews, who deny God, denies God himself;” see Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 37.

⁹⁷ Leo VII, *Fraternitatis Amore Constringimur*, To Frederick, Archbishop of Mainz, L.447-450. Geographic separation of medieval Jews from Christians occurred in two ways: expulsion, the first of which may have been that in Mainz, and forced settlement to confined ghettos, the first of which was established in Poland in the thirteenth century. Separation by expulsion became more common during and after the First Crusade, which marked the beginning of a six hundred year period between 1096 and 1650 in which Jews were forced from states across Europe, e.g. from various German states between 1096-1192, from Silesia in 1159, parts of France in 1182, 1271, and 1322, parts of Austria and Cracow, Poland in 1348, Hungary in 1349.

⁹⁸ Ivo, Bishop of Chartres’ (1090-1116) *Decretum*, was a collection of some 3700 canon and secular laws, the Jewry laws of which were heavily dependent on rulings from the councils of Toledo. *The Tripartite Commentary to the Conciliar Legislation* consisted of commentaries appended to church laws by the three

measure against such consequences Christians are reminded through both canons and commentaries that there is to be “no communion between light and darkness,” that “all who are governed by Christ...should keep far away from Jews,” and that “the Godly Fathers do not wish us to have any association with Jews.”⁹⁹

The understanding behind these mandates and warnings, as explained by mid-twelfth century Byzantine canonist Johannes Zonaras, who described Jews as “an accursed people,” was that any association with the “murder[ers] of Christ” simultaneously defiled the Christian involved while giving rise to “scandal and suspicion” among the rest of Christ’s communing body.¹⁰⁰ Paying homage and honor to Jewish rites in any way, even if one did not share in Jewish beliefs, was to behave “in the manner of Jews,” and such behavior, where not Judaizing heresy itself, was to invite heresy.¹⁰¹ Indeed, the suspicion during this time was that where there was tolerance and liberal attitudes toward Jews, favor toward Jews, defense and protection of Jews, or behavior like Jews, there too would be heresy.

Such suspicion had been primed earlier in the century in Southern France, where all of these conditions were said to have existed when two major movements of Christian dissent fomented to alarming proportions. “Whether tolerance for Jews created heresy...or heresy with its concomitant freedom of thought gave rise to liberty for the Jews,” says Louis Newman in his standard study of Jewish influence on dissenting groups in Christianity, the churchmen in this

most influential Byzantine canonists, Alexios Aristenus, Johannes Zonaras, and Theodores Balsamon. L.660-674, and 174-193.

⁹⁹ *Tripartite Commentary*, Alexios Aristenus (early 12th century), L.186 and 193; Johannes Zonaras (mid 12th), L.175-176; Theodores Balsamon (late 12th), L.185. For examples of separation decrees in Bishop Chartres *Decretum* see 1.278-279, 11.35, 13.95, 13.116-117, 13.119; L655-694.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, Johannes Zonaras, L177-178

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, Theodores Balsamon preferred “scandalmongers” to ‘Judaizer,’ unless it could be shown that they believed as Jews. Zonaras and Aristenus made no such distinction between behavior and belief. L179, 185.

period “insisted that ‘Jews disseminated heresy.’”¹⁰² Claims of Jewish culpability for influencing, instigating, or underwriting both Waldensians and Arians (the largest group of which were Cathars) were common even though both groups preached anti-Judaic tenets.¹⁰³ The Abbot of Nogent, for example, claimed in 1124 that “all of the crimes committed by the Christian [Cathars] are inspired by Jews;” Bernard of Clairvaux, in 1147, that heretical forerunners to the Waldensians regard their churches as synagogues;” and, as if in illustration, a Cathar heretic was burned at a stake erected on “Jew’s Hill” next to the Jewish cemetery in Bonn, Germany in 1163.¹⁰⁴

Jews were eventually implicated as part of the heresy problem that prompted Pope Innocent III to threaten a crusade against the heretics of Southern France. Ecclesiastical and papal steps leading to the 1209 Albigensian Crusade are also the steps leading to the establishment of the Papal Inquisition two decades later, and they begin with Pope Alexander III, who convoked the 1179 Third Lateran Council for the purpose of strengthening the unity of the church and condemning heretics.¹⁰⁵ Immediately after anathematizing those who preferred Jews to Christians as legal witnesses, the fathers anathematized Cathar-type heretics, along with any abetting them, promising remission of sins and penance for those who would “oppose this scourge” by taking up arms to drive them out of Christendom. Following this general injunction to “protect the Christian people,” Pope Lucius III, with the support of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and the 1184 Synod of Verona, imposed on bishops the duty of finding and delivering heretics in their dioceses to

¹⁰² Louis Newman, *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements*, 142. 290.

¹⁰³ Newman, 131-138, 163, 169-170, 256. Cathar-like heresies embraced a dualist view of good and evil, while Waldensian types were strongly anti-Roman and pro-biblical with Old Testament emphasis.

¹⁰⁴ Guibert of Nogent, cited in Newman, 143-44; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistle* 241, is speaking of the churches of the Petrobrusian forerunners of the Waldensians; Newman, 314-15.

¹⁰⁵ *Documents of the Ecumenical Councils*, Lateran Council III, Canons 26, 27; 206, 223-225; Norman Tanner, ed.

secular authorities.¹⁰⁶ Pope Innocent III followed in suit by repeated attempts between 1198 and 1216 to impress upon both ecclesiastical and secular rulers their indubitable duty to protect Christendom. As part of this, Innocent issued bulls to royalty and ecclesiastics throughout France and Spain about the ‘shameful’ condition of Jews being tolerated and favored in Christian lands.

It was in this vein that Innocent III threatened the Count of Toulouse in May of 1207 with excommunication and a crusade if he did not cease tolerating the practices of heretics and the “excesses” of Jews in his kingdom.¹⁰⁷ By the fall of 1208 threat had turned to reality and “God’s faithful” were preparing to bear the sign of the cross in a “labor of holiness” to “exterminate” followers of heresy in lands ruled by the Count of Toulouse.¹⁰⁸ Beziers, a town under the domain of the Count’s nephew, was among the first targets in the summer of 1209.

On July 22, a fifteen kilometer “holy procession” of three thousand horses and twenty thousand pack mules carrying nobles, weapons, and equipment, as well as thousands of walking pilgrims and “ribald boys who accompanied the crusade as servants, beggars, and thieves,” moved against the town in a wholesale butchering and incineration that included the massacre of two hundred Jews.¹⁰⁹ The principle at work in this “holy war” that lasted for twenty years was explained a few years later by a contemporary Bolognese legal scholar, Johannes Teutonicus, as

¹⁰⁶ Pope Lucius III, *Ad abolendam*, in James B. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997), 13. Quotation from Lateran III, Canon 27.

¹⁰⁷ See Chapter 2, sections IV and V for examples of Innocent’s bulls to ecclesiastical hierarchy and secular rulers in Burgandy, Nevers, Troyes, Paris, Sens, Leon, Auxierre, and Castile. Innocent III, *To Raymond, Count of Toulouse*, May 29, 1207; GI 124-125 and Simonsohn, 92-94.

¹⁰⁸ Innocent III, *To Philip the Illustrious King of France*, October 9, 1208; GI 132-133. Innocent also decreed that Jews forgive all interest on debts owed to them by the crusaders.

¹⁰⁹ The Count of Toulouse, Raimon VI, was persuaded to publicly repent on June 18, 1209 through public scourging, humiliation, and renewed oath of fidelity to the church. He was then permitted to wear the cross and “avenge the injuries done to the crucifix,” which included leading the crusade from Montpellier to Beziers. His nephew, Raimon Roger Trencavel, viscount of Beziers, Carcassonne, Razès, and Albi, also attempted to join the crusaders but permission was denied. He escaped the massacre at Beziers, surrendered at Caracossoenne, and died of illness in November of the same year. Mark Gregory Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 68-100.

an if/then conditional: “If it can be shown that some heretics are in a city,” he lectured, “then all the inhabitants can be burnt.”¹¹⁰ In the case of Beziers and other early targets of the crusaders, there would have been no doubt that heretics were indeed *in* the cities, for Dominic Guzman had been preaching in those very areas since 1205 at the behest of Pope Innocent III.¹¹¹

While beyond the scope of this study discuss sermon attacks in Southern France, it is important to note that Dominic’s preaching against heresy both prior to and during the early years of the crusade paved the way for his 1215 founding of a religious order that was instrumental in Christianity’s fight against heresy. As demonstrated by Jeremy Cohen in *The Friars and the Jews*, the Dominican Order, as well as the later Franciscan, was “marked by an aggressive missionary spirit and often violent animosity toward Jews.” Indeed, from the establishment of the Dominicans “until the end of the medieval period and even beyond, Dominican and Franciscan friars directed and oversaw virtually all of the anti-Jewish activities of the Christian clergy in the West,” including the active promotion of “anti-Jewish hatred among the laity of Western Christendom.”¹¹²

Just months after Dominic’s Order of Preachers was made formal on a local level by the Bishop of Toulouse in the summer of 1215, he attended Innocent III’s Fourth Lateran Council in

¹¹⁰ Pegg, 77.

¹¹¹ St. Dominic began preaching in Languedoc in late 1204 or early 1205. By 1206 he had established a convent for women converts from heresy at Prouill, which also served as a base for preaching expeditions to towns that would become four of the first crusader targets: Beziers, Caracossone, Fanjeaux, and Servian. When the crusade began in the summer of 1209, Dominic “participated... but,” according to *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “always on the side of mercy, wielding the arms of the spirit while others wrought death and desolation with the sword.” After forging a friendship with Simon de Montfort, general leader of the crusade, he accompanied him at various sieges in 1211, 1212, and 1213, “praying for the triumph of Catholic arms.” In August of 1214 after de Montfort “slaughtered the defenders [of Casseneuil and] razed the walls, [he] gave the town revenues to Dominic,” a ‘donation’ that likely served as seed money to found his religious order. The Order of Preachers was formalized by the Bishop of Toulouse in the summer of 1215 and by Pope Innocent III in December of 1216. John Bonaventure O’Connor, “St. Dominic,” *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol.5, 1909; Pegg, 138.

¹¹² Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982), especially 13, 36-37, 40-45.

Rome. Innocent's resolve to strengthen both ecclesiastical and secular structures of Christendom in the face of continuing heretical threat had included his summoning of bishops, abbots, priors, church chapters, religious orders, "kings and civil authorities throughout Europe."¹¹³ With the exception of one or two bishops in each province, "all were ordered to be present." When the Council convened in November of 1215, "all heretics under whatever names they may be known" were condemned, and the process by which they were to be identified and separated out was incorporated into canon law. Archbishops and bishops, or appointed representatives, were to "compel" three or more men in each neighborhood of each diocese to report the presence of any activity that differed "from the common way of the faithful," while those at the head of this chain were to make annual rounds to each diocese to judge reported cases. Those deemed 'suspected heretics' by the ecclesiastical judges were to be anathematized and given a year to prove their innocence before being condemned as heretics. Those condemned were to be given over to civil authorities, who, by virtue of being the authorities, were compelled to publicly swear to "exterminate" all heretics named by the church. Refusal to carry out sentencing was to result in excommunication of noncompliant authorities and, if refusal persisted beyond a year, the pope was given the power to "declare the ruler's vassals absolved...and offer the territory to [those who would exterminate] the heretics." The same held true in the case of bishops and archbishops. Any who failed to be scrupulously vigilant in the steps to "cleans[e] the dioceses of the ferment of heretical wickedness" were to be deposed and replaced by those who would. Those who agreed to "gird themselves with the cross for the extermination of heretics," on the other hand, whether ecclesiastics, rulers, or ordinary lay, were to enjoy the same "indulgences and privileges granted

¹¹³ Lateran Council IV, *Documents of the Ecumenical Councils*, Lateran IV, Tanner, 227. Given, p.13, points out that Innocent III's 1199 bull *Vergentis in Senium* had already equated "heresy to treason as defined in Roman law."

to those who go in defense of the Holy Land.”¹¹⁴ Along with this systematic plan to extirpate heresy from Christendom, Pope Innocent III and the fathers of the Council decreed as canon law that Jews who are forcibly baptized must remain Christian. With the sanction of baptism being irrevocable, baptized Jews were to be compelled to abandon all rites of Judaism on threat of being formally classified as Judaizing heretics.¹¹⁵

In the same period, the ‘Judaizer’ label was being used to denote a whole movement of pro-Jewish Christian heretics in Lombardy, to which Dominic was dispatched by Pope Honorius III in 1219 to conduct a “preaching crusade.” The year before Dominic died, 1220, the newly crowned Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II (1220-1250) also engaged against this movement, which he called the Passagii, repeatedly assailing them in his widely dispersed promulgations against heresy as “the *Circumcisi*.”¹¹⁶ This clearly ‘Jewish’ rubric, Newman says, was used in at least three ways to refer to “Judaizing Christians, relapsed [baptized] Jews, and the Passagii, all of whom were designated heretics. Frederick added yet another class to this ‘Judaizing’ conflation in 1224 when, among his promulgations against Jews, he extended the reach of the ecclesiastic inquisition in Messina, Italy to include non-baptized Jews who dared to have religious association or intimate relations with Christian women.”

Pope Gregory IX issued bulls calling for Dominicans to establish the Papal Inquisition of Depraved Heresy after the turn of the decade. By 1233, he had commissioned papal tribunals at Toulouse and Caracassone where Dominic had preached prior to and during the Albigensian

¹¹⁴ Lateran IV Council, Canon 3, *Medieval Sourcebook* translation.

¹¹⁵ Lateran IV, Canon 70. See also Council of Mainz decree of 1310: “any Christian reverting to Judaism, even if he was baptized as an infant and brought into the fold by force, is a heretic;” GII, 289-90.

¹¹⁶ Newman, 140-141, 290-293, 307; Given, 13. At roughly the same time in Spain, the soon to be Bishop Lucas of Tuy was denouncing Jews in *Adversus Albigenses* (ca.1227-1233) as those who “sow heresies more freely...so they can pervert the Catholic faith,” and Cathar heretics as those who “stimulate the perfidy of Jews.”

Crusade, and where now nearby stood three Dominican convents from which the brethren disseminated their preaching against heresy.¹¹⁷ Whether or not there is a causal connection to thirty years of Dominican antiJewish preaching and three years of Inquisitional activities, it remains a sobering fact that in 1236 twenty five hundred Jews were mercilessly slaughtered in Southern France by crusaders from French provinces that were in the jurisdiction of the preachers and tribunals at Toulouse and Carcassonne.¹¹⁸ Holy books were burned, properties confiscated, and bodies exposed to scavenging beasts and birds, on the grounds that Jews “refused to be baptized” into the light of Christianity.¹¹⁹ After condemning crusaders for murdering Jews, stealing their property, and burning their books, Gregory issued an infamous bull three years later - “if what is said about the Jews of France and other lands is true, no punishment would be sufficiently great or sufficiently worthy of their crime” - calling on Dominican and Franciscan Inquisitors to seize Jewish books in France, England, Spain, and Portugal, examine for heresies, and burn at the stake those deemed to be heretical.¹²⁰ The subsequent expelling of Jews from Brittany on the western French coast in late 1239 or early 1240 by a council of nobles, priests, and bourgeois who confiscated their properties and decreed that “no one shall in any manner be

¹¹⁷ Pope Gregory IX, *Excommunicamus*, February 1231, and *Ille humani generis*, October 1231. Given, 13-15; Pegg, 184; O’Connor, “St.Dominic.” The Dominican houses were located at Prouille, Toulouse, and Fanjeaux.

¹¹⁸ According to Gregory IX, the crusaders were from the southwestern provinces of Angers, Poitiers, Le Mans, Tours, and Bourges; GI 226-231. They were apparently part of the crusade commissioned by him in 1234 to arrive in the holy land by 1239 to block the infidel takeover of Jerusalem when the 10 year treaty expired between Frederick II and Muslim authorities. Crusaders, led by Richard of Cromwell and Simon de Montfort Lichester, heir to the leader of the Albigensian Crusade, embarked on the expedition in 1236 but did not reach Palestine until 1240; GI,216.

¹¹⁹ Gregory IX, *To the Archbishop of Bordeaux and to the Bishops of Saintes, Angouleme and Poitiers; To the King of France; To Bishops of See, Avranches, Le Mans, Angers, Rennes, Nantes, and Quimpe; To the Archbishops of Rouen, Tours, and Bourges*, September 5, 1236; G226-231.

¹²⁰ Gregory IX, *To the Archbishops Throughout the Kingdom of France*, June 9, 1239; *To the Kings of Portugal, France, England, Aragon, Castile, Leon, Navarre*, June 20, 1239; *To the Bishop of Paris, Prior of the Dominicans ,and Minister of the Franciscan Friars*, June 20, 1239; GI240-244.

accused or summoned for the death of a Jew who has been killed,” may or may not have been related. Events more clearly the result of Gregory’s bull are the 1242 trial and condemnation of the Talmud in Paris, where some ten to twelve thousand Jewish books were burned in the course of thirty six hours; the 1243 Council of Tarracona in Spain, where it was decreed that Christians must avoid Jews “because of the danger of heresy.”¹²¹

Among those direct results was a reiteration of Gregory’s demands by Pope Innocent IV in 1244, who called on the King of France “to strike down with merited severity all the detestable and heinous [Jewish blasphemies]...committed in insult of the Creator and injury of the Christian name.” Again, “condemned” books, as well as “condemned” commentaries on books, were to “be burned wherever they c[ould] be found,” and the King was to “stringently forbid Jews to have any Christian nurses or other Christian servants, lest the children of the free-born serve the children of the maid servants.” By enforcement of these acts, the Pope informed, Jews were to recognize themselves “as slaves of those whom the death of Christ set free while condemning them to slavery.”¹²²

The burning of thousands of Jewish books in Paris the same year; massive investigations of heresy in Toulouse throughout the decade;¹²³ Innocent IV’s 1253 permission for the Archbishop of Vienne to expel Jews on the grounds that “Christians are... threatened with serious danger because of intercourse with Jews;”¹²⁴ Pope Alexander IV’s 1258 bull to the Archbishops and Bishops of France, which speaks of Jews as “ingrate enemies of the Cross and Christian

¹²¹ Cohen, 63; Decree of John, Duke of Brittany, GI, 344-345; The Council of Tarracona, May 5, 1243; GI, 329, cites Heinrich Finke, *Konzilienstudien zur Geschichte des 13ten Jahrhunderts* (Muenster, 1891).

¹²² Innocent IV, *To the King of France*, May 9, 1244; GI 250-253.

¹²³ Given, 14, 35.

¹²⁴ Innocent IV, *To the Archbishop of Vienne*, July 22, 1253, GI, 292-3.

Faith,”¹²⁵ were all in the background when the first church council in Christendom formally required the geographic separation of Jews in 1266.

What is now modern day Poland was not yet two hundred years old in terms of being Christianized when the Council of Breslau decreed that Jews live in one contiguous area separated by way of wall or moat, wear identifiable pointed hats, and stay behind closed doors when Christian processions bearing the sacrament passed through their sequestered area.¹²⁶ A few months before the 1266 Council took measures to protect its “tender Christian shoots” from Jewish influence in Breslau, however, Pope Clement IV had expressed concern to the Archbishop of Breslau, Cracow, Kolberg, and Posen about the “situation in Poland” where Jews were allowed to live in ways that did not reflect their “deserved servitude.”¹²⁷ After the Breslau Council passed correcting decrees, Clement issued the bull *Damnabili Perfidia Judaeorum* to the King of Aragon in July of 1267, instructing that he, his barons, and the Archbishop were to take “active measures against Jews,” which were to include finding, examining, and condemning all Jewish books that contained “heresies and errors.” Two weeks later he issued the bull *Turbato corde* which authorized Dominican and Franciscan Inquisitors, with no limitations to time or place, to reach beyond the boundaries of Christendom to those who had “defected to Judaism.” Christians found guilty of the “crime” of converting to Judaism were to be officially treated like other Christian heretics, as were practicing Jews who were found guilty of “inducing” them to defect from

¹²⁵ Alexander IV, *To the Archbishops and Bishops of France*, August 23, 1258; GII, 62-63.

¹²⁶ Council of Breslau, 1266; GII, 244-45. Jews were also barred from holding public office and associating with Christians in public bathing, food, and drinking places. Other early attempts at geographical separation of Jews were made in France and Italy, where Christianity’s roots ran much deeper than those in Poland. In Bourges (1276) and Poitiers (1280), where Jews had been slaughtered in 1239, and in Ravenna (1311), church councils passed canon laws which required that Jews live in specified towns, that their places of residences be reported, and that they not remain longer than a month in any location without a synagogue; GII, 287-288.

¹²⁷ Pope Clement IV, *Peccatum Peccavit*; addressee was likely John, Archbishop of Gnesen (1258-1274), with a date of late 1265 or early 1266; GII, 110-112, ff.1, 2.

Christianity. The bull *Professionis Christianae* followed three weeks later, in which Clement urged the Count of Burgundy to uproot the “heretical apostasy” of Jews who had converted to Christianity and then returned to the corruption of Judaism.” A second *Damnabili Perfidia Judaeorum* was issued near the end of the year which took up the problem of “Jews wickedly try[ing] to attract simple-minded Christians to their rites” in Poitiers (where Jews were slaughtered in 1239) and in Toulouse and Provence (home of an Inquisitional tribunal and center of the Albigensean Crusade). In each of these bulls, Clement highlighted his grief over Jewish influences (bold mingling with Christians), Jewish excesses (building beautiful synagogues), or Jewish abuses (proselytizing or being in possession of the heretical Talmud), referring to these alternately as “obvious danger[s],” causes of injury to both church and people, and attempts to “subver[t] the Christian faith.”¹²⁸

Over the three remaining decades of the thirteenth century, six additional popes argued in much the same way in efforts to halt the spread of what Pope Gregory X (1271-76) referred to in 1274 as a “plague” of unbelief and blasphemy. In 1276, when faced by mounting numbers of backsliding converted Jews in Southern France, most of whom had been baptized by coercion, Nicholas III (1277-80) responded to Dominican requests for help with the ‘rejudaizing’ problem in several ways. On May 7, 1277 he ordered Dominicans to move against the rejudaizers as against heretics, with the result that several were burned at the stake by his direct order, and in the last five months of 1278 he directed both Dominicans and Franciscans to gather Jews on a regular basis for forced Christian sermons in Lombardy, Austria, and Sicily.¹²⁹ With the problem still

¹²⁸ Ibid, *Damnabili Perfidia Judaeorum*, To the King of Aragon, July 15, 1267; GII, 97-102. *Turbato Corde*, To the Friars of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders, July 27, 1267; GII, 102-104. *Professionis Christianae*, To John de Salins, Count of Burgundy, August 17, 1267; GII, 104-106. *Damnabili Perfidia Judaeorum*, To the Archbishops and Bishops in the territory of the Counties of Poitiers, Toulouse, and Provence, December 23, 1267; GII, 106-110.

¹²⁹ Pope Gregory X, *Turbato Corde*, To the Friars of the Dominican and Franciscan orders who are or will be deputized by the Holy See as Inquisitors of Heresy, March 1, 1274; GII, 120-123.

unresolved in 1281, Pope Martin IV (1281-85) reminded the Archbishop and Bishops of France that “enemies of the orthodox faith must be extirpated.” Five years later Pope Honorius IV (1285-87) also reminded the Archbishop of Canterbury that Jews who “criminally invite[d]” orthodox Christians to synagogues, and Christians who “show[ed] reverence” to Jewish scrolls were symptoms of “a dangerous sickness must not be neglected.” By turn, while implicating Jews as “corrupters of our faith [who] daily foment apostasy,” Nicholas IV (1288-92) insisted to the Archbishops, Bishops, and Abbots of Aix, Arles, and Embrun in 1290 that counteractions had to be taken against the “poisonous spiritual ailment” of heresy. By the end of the century, Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) had set down in his *Decretals* that in cases of Christians who adopted Judaism, as well as baptized Jews who reverted to Judaism, Inquisitors “must” proceed against both, showing no difference between Jews who had been baptized as infants and those who had been forced to convert on threat of death. Both categories were to be proceeded against by the Inquisitors just “as one would proceed against heretics who had confessed or been convicted,” and the same held true, he instructed, for their “abettors, receivers, and defenders.”¹³⁰

The Inquisitors to whom Boniface referred were those Dominicans and Franciscans who bore titles such as “Inquisitor of Judaizing Christians,” “Inquisitor in Provence Against Heretics and Wicked Christians who Embrace Judaism,” and “Inquisitors of the Depraved and Perfidious Heresy of the Jews.”¹³¹ Instructions for these and other such special offices were gathered together and sectioned in a manual entitled *Practica Inquisitionis Hereticae Pravitatis (Conduct of the Inquisition into Heretical Wickedness)* by Dominican Bernard Gui, Inquisitor of Toulouse

Pope Nicholas III, Neuman 375-378; Simonsohn, 248-253.

¹³⁰ Pope Martin IV, *Ex Parte Dilectorum*, To the Archbishops and Bishops of France, October 21, 1281; GII, 150-51. Pope Honorius IV, *Nimis in Partibus*, To the Archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans, November 30, 1286; GII, 157-162. Pope Nicholas IV, *Attendite Fratres*, To the Archbishop, Bishops, Abbots, and Other Prelates in the Provinces of Aix, Arles, and Embrun, January 28, 1290; GII, 174-178. Pope Boniface VIII, *Decretals* (before 1298); GII, 209.

¹³¹ Cited in Newman, 374-389. The first official title appears in 1274, the latter two in 1285.

from 1307 to 1323. Those who were to be proceeded against were referred to in the guide as “perfidious Jews,” “heretics of that damnable sect,” and “enemies of the cross of Christ,” and Judaism, that “damnable rite of the Jews,” was referred to as the “vomit” to which Jews return when they “rejudaize” themselves in “their execrable rite.” Sections covering sundry problems that might be encountered, such as the “Method of abjuration of Jews who have been seized, and have confessed that they have been guilty of enormous offenses against the Catholic Faith,” and “Method of abjuration of those who, converted from the perfidy of Jews to the faith of baptism, return to the vomit of Judaism,” were also included, as were form-letters for “Imposing arbitrary penitence without public notice on any Jew for receiving baptized apostates or otherwise showing any favor” and “Release of any Jew from prison to which he has been sentenced for acts committed against the faith.” The tenet around which forms and instructions were organized was also clearly stated: that “perfidious Jews attempt when and wherever possible to secretly pervert the Christians.”¹³² And indeed it would have been strange had it not, for this depiction of the Jew as a highly probable threat to Christians and Christianity was no less an identifying badge than was the material badge required by the 1215 Fourth Lateran Council and enforced by council after council throughout the remainder of the Middle Ages.¹³³

¹³² Bernard Gui, *Practica Inquisitionis Hereticae Pravitatis*. English translation of passages appear in Newman, 382-390. *Practica* later provided structure for the fifteenth century Spanish Inquisition created specifically to deal with ‘Judaizing’ Jews.

¹³³ Lateran IV, Canon 68, decreed distinguishing clothing for Jews but left it up to local councils and civil laws to determine the type of adornment. Pointed hats and outer garments of certain lengths with a particular style of sleeves were variously used, but the Jewish Badge became the mainstay of identification, with yellow as the predominant color of choice. See Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, Revised Edition (New York: Hermon Press, 1966), pp. 60-70, for a detailed discussion of the badge and other identifying clothing.

CHAPTER IV
A MODERN CONVOLUTION:
THREAT OF THE JUDAIZING ACCURSED TO ESTABLISHED DOMINION

Propagation of the alleged threat of Jewish influence encountered no barrier as it made its way to the other side of the Middle Ages. To Judaize, which said so much with such expediency, was still to assault the one truth, still to infect and pollute the Christian populace, still to act surreptitiously to undermine the foundations of Christianity, still to be the enemy of God, and, as evidenced by the fate of religious reformer John Huss, still to be instigated by Jews. With the words “Oh thou accursed Judas, who breaking away from the counsels of peace hast consulted with the Jews,” Huss was pronounced a Judaizing heretic and burned at the stake on July 6, 1415 in Constance, Germany,¹ and he was not the first or last on this side of history to be pronounced so. In 1480 the ruling monarchy of Spain established the Spanish Inquisition as a religious institution imbued with the task of finding and prosecuting converted Jews who were secretly Judaizing. To eliminate support of alleged defecting converts, unbaptized Jews were expelled from Spain in 1492, while converted Jews were subjected to ever-increasing threats of inquisitional pyres for such Judaizing ‘crimes’ as “abstaining from Pork, using olive oil rather than lard, changing sheets every Friday, calling their children by Old Testament names, standing to pray, or turning to face a wall when hearing of a death.”²

¹ Neuman, 237, 437; Tractenberg, 176. The Theological Faculty of the University of Vienna also accused Jews (in 1419) of being in conspiracy with Judaizing Hussites and Waldensians.

² Estimates for converted Jews in 1492, variously called Marranos, Conversos, Confesos, Crypto-Jews, or Portuguese Christians, range from 250,000 to one million. See Jerome Friedman, “Jewish Conversion, the Spanish Pure Blood Laws and Reformation,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol.18, No.1 (Spring 1987), 5, 8, 12, 15. Hans Kueng, *The Catholic Church: A Short History*, translated by John Bowden (New York:

A fury of Judaizing claims was also unleashed in Central Europe as Reformation disputers of all persuasions hurled the pejorative label at each other.³ Luther accused Sabbatarians, Anabaptists, and Catholics of Judaizing; Catholics accused followers of Hus, Wycliffe, Zwingli, and Calvin; Calvinists accused Lutherans and Unitarians; and Unitarians, under the leadership of Michael Severetus, accused Calvin, and this, back and forth, until Severetus was burned at the stake in 1553. Those who followed Hebrew manuscripts too closely in teachings and translations were especially maligned. Luther, for example, charged one Protestant translator with being “an out and out Judaizer...who ruined the New Testament with his abominable Judaisms,” and, in another case, charged a fellow professor at Wittenberg with being “a Christian in name, but in true fact, a Jew of the Jews.”⁴ Catholics in turn reviled Luther’s translation as that of a “Judaizer,” a “Jew,” a “Half-Jew,” and a “Jewish-patron,” while bringing formal charges against four Sorbonne professors for using books that had been printed by Jews converted to Lutheranism. All sides, on the other hand, condemned as heretical Hebraists who either converted from Judaism or came from families of converted Jews, regardless of their religious affiliation. They “*judenzen* (Judaize) greatly,” Luther taught, and “in the book I have written against Jews, I have them also in mind.”⁵

The book to which Luther referred was his recently published *Against the Jews and Their Lies*, which warned of Jewish perversion of scriptures as well as the methods in which “miserable

Modern Library, 2003), reports that some 9000 *autos-da-fe* occurred between 1483 and 1498 under Cardinal Torquemada, the first Grand Inquisitor of Spain, appointed by Pope Sixtus IV; 132.

³ See Salo Baron, 380-399; Newman, 1-27, 435-630; Jerome Friedman, 24-26; Tractenberg, 175-187; Gerhard Falk, *The Jew in Christian Theology: Martin Luther’s Anti-Jewish Vom Schem Hamporas* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland Press, 1992), 58-62; Paul Lawrence Rose, *Bodin and the Great God of Nature: The Moral and Religious Universe of a Judaizer* (Geneva, 1980), 5-9.

⁴ Sebastian Muenster was the Hebrew translator, and the Professor of Hebrew at Wittenberg was Johann Boeschenstein. Newman, 618-619; Tractenberg, 186; Friedman 25-26.

⁵ Newman, 619.

and accursed” Jews lured and duped Christians into Jewish “wretchedness.” His purpose in publishing this book in 1543, as evidenced by opening statements in both *Against the Jews and Their Lies* and *Vom Schem Hamphoras*, was to teach Germans “from historical evidence what a Jew is so that we [Germans] can warn our Christians against them.” The need for Germans to be warned against Jews, he said, was as great as the need to be warned “against the devil himself,” for, while operating under the guise of religion, truth, and benevolence, Jews blasphemed Christ, called down hellfire on Christian heads, and trained “their children from infancy to be the bitter, virulent, and wrathful enemies of Christians.” Indeed, Jewish hatred of non-Jews had so “penetrated flesh and blood, marrow and bone,” he warned, that it had “become part and parcel of their nature and life.” The need to “be on guard” and to “govern yourself accordingly” was great, he warned, for “next to the devil you have no more bitter, venomous, and vehement enemy than a real Jew who earnestly seeks to be a Jew;” the lineage and circumcision of this “miserable and accursed” people “infect them all.”⁶

While these warnings are not unique to 1543, nor are they novel to Reformation teachings, they are significant in several ways. First, Luther has clearly transported to modern Germany the ancient Christian teaching of Jewish inherent hatred of Christians, as well as that of the Jew as the preeminent adversary and enemy of Christianity. Secondly, he has invoked these well-worn teachings with a notable shift in emphasis by speaking of the 'problem' of Jews dwelling among Germans rather than Jews dwelling among Christians. Third, he has made clear

⁶ Martin Luther, *Against the Jews and Their Lies* (1543) and *Vom Schem Hamphoras* (1543). Luther makes this statement in the context of discussing both treatises. See Volume 47, *Luther's Works*, “So that our Germans might be informed,” 140, 265. Warnings about Jewish hatred included an alleged Jewish “commission” to murder and slay Christians, the poisoning of wells, the kidnapping and piercing of Christian children, of which, he says, Jews are perfectly capable of doing whether or not they have done so historically; for example, 137, 139, 156-58, 213-17, 257, 264. See also Gerhard Falk, *The Jew in Christian Theology, including Martin Luther's Anti-Jewish Vom Schem Hamphoras, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1992).

that these warnings against Jews apply equally to converted Jews who work as Judaizing Hebraists. Helping all of this along, no doubt, was his translation of the New Testament, which told in German words of the crucifying acts and stories that were said to exemplify Jewish hatred for God and Christianity. Indeed, his selective use of the term *Judentum* to speak of Jews and Judaism as a collective unit only appears in three places, all of which portray Jews and Judaism as either the persecutor of God's church or as the so-called 'Judaizing' party' that opposed God's truth.⁷

The other related and well-worn teaching, both explicit and implicit in *Against the Jews and Their Lies*, is that of "Jewish misery and accursedness" - by which is meant divine Jewish exile, loss of Jewish sovereignty, dependent existence under Christian domain, and all other adversity that had historically befallen Jews since their alleged crucifixion of Christ. That Christians should be warned and terrified by this ongoing divine act of judgment was one of Luther's oft-taught themes in lectures, sermons, and commentaries, appearing as early as some two to four years before he nailed his 95 theses to the door at Wittenberg in 1517. The continual public suffering of Jews "as an example...to all the nations," he said, was the manifestation of God's most righteous anger and a judgment far more awful than complete destruction of Jews.⁸

⁷ In *Galatians* 1.13-14 Luther uses *Judentum* as a rendering for *Ioudaismos*, traditionally transliterated as 'Judaism,' to speak of his former life as a persecutor of the church of God. In *Galatians* 2.12 he uses *Judentum* to speak of the 'circumcised' (*tous ek peritomēs*) who invoked fear in the apostle James. He uses *Judentum* in non-biblical works 3 times between 1521 and 1527: *Evangelium von der Zehn Aussaetzigen* (1521, Vol. 8), *Das Siebente Kapitel 5. Pauli zu den Corinthern ausgelegt* (1523, Vol.12), *Evangelion auff den Sontag nach Epiphanie. Luke 2* (ca.1525-1527). Search performed by *Index Verborum: Martin Luther's German Writings*, Weimar Edition, 1516-1527 (<http://luther.b.c.edu/inhalt1.html>.)

⁸ Franklin Sherman, editor of *Luther's Works*, Volume 47, 126-127, points out that Wilhelm Maurer has effectively shown that Luther's earliest lectures on Psalms in 1513-1515 contain "the whole burden of his [future] charges against Jews." As a refute to those who insist that Luther's 1543 *On the Jews and Their Lies* is a radical change from his attitude toward Jews in his 1523 *That Jesus Christ was a Jew*, Maurer points to Luther's lectures and sermons on *Psalms* to illustrate that the underlying theology remains the same both before and after conversion. Wilhelm Maurer, "Die Zeit der Reformation, *Kirche und Synagoge*, K.H.Rengstorff and S. von Kortzfleisch (Stuttgart, 1968. See Martin Luther, *Psalm 59, First*

Such longevity of misery is said to be God's damning silence, and the silence is said to be both evidence that Jews "committed ...sins previously unheard of on earth," and "proof" that they have been completely forsaken by God. This latter point, to which Luther returns in his 1538 treatise against the Judaizing sect of Sabbatarians, is part of a long and ranging argument on God's judgment of Jews, one that opens, closes, and is shored up in-between by claims that God has now abandoned Jews for fourteen hundred years, that there is no end in sight to their "long and gruesome punishment," that "not even a fly flicks a wing for their consolation."⁹ His mind was unchanged three years before his death when he penned his 1543 treatises on "those miserable and accursed people" who have "failed to learn any lesson from the[ir] terrible distress." As in earlier writings, Luther insisted that such demonstration of God's wrath was sufficient evidence that Jews are guilty, intractable, and wholly rejected by God. "Even a child can comprehend this," he taught, for God would not punish Jews "so long, so terribly, so unmercifully" without just cause.¹⁰

This doctrine of divinely ordained punishment of Jews flourished at the highest levels of Catholicism as well. Fifty-four days after Cardinal Gian Carafa¹¹ was installed as Pope Paul IV

Lectures on the Psalms, Luther's Works, Jaroslav Pelican, ed. (Saint Louis: Fortress Press, 1955-1986), Volume 10, 272-279.

⁹ Ibid., *Against the Sabbatarians*, Volume 47, *Luther's Works*, 59-98, in which there is hardly a page devoid of some aspect of this argument; quotations on 62-63, 67, 72, 97.

¹⁰ Ibid., *Against the Jews and Their Lies*, 137-39, 266-272: "What shall we Christians do with this rejected and condemned people" who live among us and refuse to learn their lesson?" Luther's infamous solution answer - burn and bury Jewish synagogues and schools, raze and destroy Jewish homes, confiscate the Talmud and prayer books, forbid rabbis to teach, abolish safe conduct for Jews, prohibit usury, force Jews to "earn their bread in the sweat of their brow - was to be implemented so that "God might see that we are Christians and do not condone" Jewish distortions of truth. This "sharp mercy" was not to be seen as personal revenge but as a holy intolerance of blasphemy and defamation of Christianity. To not take this approach, he taught, would be equal to blaspheming and defaming Christ and Christianity, but doing so would "bring home to them the fact that they are not masters in our country, as they boast, but that they are living in exile and in captivity."

¹¹ In 1542 Cardinal Carafa founded the Sanctum Officium Sanctissimae Inquisitionis, the guiding center of the Inquisition for all Catholic countries and producer of the first *Index of Prohibited Books*. He was said

on July 17, 1555, he issued the harshly restrictive bull *Cum nimis absurdum*, which began “it is utterly absurd and impermissible that Jews, whom God has condemned to eternal slavery because of their guilt ...repay our graciousness with base ingratitude...instead of being humbly submissive.” Jews in Rome and other territories of the Papal States were then charged with “striving for power” and attempting to gain “dominion over [Christians]” through the insolent acts of moving into the “more noble” sections of towns, purchasing property, building houses in Christian areas, hiring Christian servants, and refusing to wear identifying clothing or badges. Fifteen paragraphs of harshly suppressive measures followed, requiring Jews to sell all “real [Jewish] property” to Christians, demolish and destroy all but one synagogue in any given ghetto, carry on no business other than “dealing in secondhand clothing,” and observe “all statutes that give advantage to Christians over Jews.” The statutes were intended, Pope Paul IV said, to help Jews “recognize through experience that they have been made slaves while Christians have been made free.”¹²

While the ghetto system created by *Cum nimis* was something new,¹³ the papal theology informing it was not, nor was it any coincidence that the language of the bull was taken from

to have been personally responsible for the onslaught of the Marranos of Ancona, resulting in 100 arrests, 50 sentences by the Inquisitional tribunal, and 25 burnings at the stake in 1556; *Encyclopedia Judaica* and Hans Kueng, *The Catholic Church: A Short History*, translated by John Bowden (New York: The Modern Library, 2003), 135.

¹² Paul IV, *Cum nimis absurdum*, July 17, 1555. Translation of the opening paragraph of *Cum nimis absurdum* appears in Alex Bein, *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*, translated by Harry Zohn (New York: Herzl Press, 1990), p.148. All further quotations are from Kenneth Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555-1593* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1977), 291-298.

¹³ Kenneth Stow argues convincingly in *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy* (pp. 3-59) that *Cum nimis* represents a shift in the slightly more relaxed Jewry laws held by Paul IV's immediate predecessors, Paul II (1534-49) and Julius III (1550-55). The two earlier popes held that a more generous approach to Jews would be conversion-hastening, while Paul IV held that increased suppression would hasten Jewish conversion. Stow does not mention, however, that Luther offered the same reason for harsher measures against Jews: a “sharp mercy...might save at least a few from the growing flames [of hell]; see *On the Jews and Their Lies*, 137-139, 266-272.

Pope Innocent III's 1205 *Etsi Iudaeos*.¹⁴ Pope Paul IV not only adopted Innocent's actual wording of *Etsi Iudaeos*, he modeled *Cum nimis* on the 1215 Lateran IV canon of the same title, which was subsequently incorporated into the 1234 *Decretals* of Gregory IX which still served as "the official book of Church law."¹⁵ Moreover, both Paul IV and Innocent III viewed enforced suppression of Jews as a divinely instituted means to publicly demonstrate both Jewish guilt and the reality of divine justice, and both claimed that their respective litanies of Jewish 'offences' were instances of "unlawful usurpation of authority and dominion over Christians." The two popes were also in agreement that guilt for the crucifixion consigned Jews to perpetual servitude, that it was only because of Christian piety that Jews were allowed to live in Christian lands, and that it was a gross breach of divine arrangement for Jews to attempt to do other than accept their divinely imposed subservience. In all of these ways, the sixteenth century closed ghetto system created by *Cum nimis* can be seen as an answer to thirteenth century papal concerns: a divinely ordained penal structure in which Jews could see and experience the differences between those who shed the blood of Christ and those who gained dominion by the shed blood of Christ. The penultimate decree - that offenders would be "punished according to the nature of the transgression, either as rebels or perpetrators of the crime of *lese majeste* and as those who have renounced their allegiance to the entire Christian people"- was also in keeping with the theology of divinely imposed Jewish suffering which underlay all policies of Christian dominion over Jews.¹⁶ The significant difference here is that the restrictions of *Cum nimis*, along with minor

¹⁴ See Chapter 2 of present study.

¹⁵ Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy*, 8-9.

¹⁶ The crime of *lese majeste*, violating majesty, developed from the ancient Roman law concept *laesa maiestas* in 13th century France. Laws against usurping or disregarding sovereignty, and thereby constituting treason, were "necessarily based on *lese majeste* rather than on the more feudal foundation of the breach of a sworn oath of fidelity, because, in a strict sense, infidelity was [viewed as] an unwarranted breach of faith." *Lese maeste* was apparently preferable to breaches of fidelity in the case of Jews, for breaches of fidelity implied a "voluntary joint contract of vassalage which allowed a wronged vassal the

amendments by popes over the remaining century, determined the harsh conditions under which Jews existed for the next three hundred years.¹⁷

Immediately before, during, and shortly after the implementation of *Cum nimis*, the Council of Trent convened in three separate terms between 1545 and 1563 to formulate official doctrinal responses to increasing Reformation challenges to the Roman Church.¹⁸ The first theological problem on the agenda was the defense of the Roman version of divinely revealed truth. By April 1546, the canon of the Christian bible had been formally fixed for the first time in Christian history, the Latin Vulgate had been declared the only authoritative version, the Catholic Church had been decreed as “judge of the true sense” of its scriptures, and Catholic communicants had been forbidden, on threat of anathema, to reject any part of the authorized version or to interpret it contrary to accepted Church tradition. The two decrees embodying these rulings, both of which were seen as crucial to the Reformation battles, were to guide all authorized translations of the Catholic canon into vernacular languages. One of the earliest manifestations of this turn of events was the decision to arm English speaking Catholics with a

right to seek justice against his lord,” and the subservience of Jews to Christians was neither voluntary nor imbued with the right to question the equality of the dominion-subservience system. See Kathleen Ann Parrow, *From Defense to Resistance: Justification of Violence During the French Wars of Religion* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993), 22-24.

¹⁷ *Cum Nimis* included harsh enforcement policies on Jewish dress codes; prohibitions against Christian nurses and servants; dining, entertaining or friendships with Christians; working on Christian holidays or Sundays; use of any alphabet other than Latin for accounting purposes; Jewish physicians attending Christian patients; allowing Christians to address Jews as “Master;” and oppression of Christians in any manner, including contracts of indebtedness. Stow does not mention, however, that Luther offered the same reason for the harsh measures called for in *On the Jews and Their Lies*: “sharp mercy...might save at least a few from the glowing flames [of hell],” see ff.19. Sanctions were continued with minor concessions by Pius IV (1559-1565); Pius V (1566-72), who extended them “to all Jews wherever they lived;” Gregory XIII (1572-1585), who elaborated his predecessor’s concerns and imposed compulsory sermons for Jews in Rome; Sixtus V (1585-90), with minor exceptions; and Clement VIII (1592-1605, who cancelled the exceptions of Pius IV and Sixtus V. See Stow’s standard analysis, 13-50.

¹⁸ The Council of Trent convened between 1545-1548, 1551-1552, 1562-1563. Statutes on the bible were decreed in the first term, Session, 4, Canons 1, 2. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Volume 2, Norman Tanner, ed. 663-665. See also *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*, J. Waterworth, trans. (London: Dolman, 1848), Hannover Historical Texts Project Online.

translation of the bible that would refute ‘false’ Protestant translations already in circulation: Wycliffe (1384), Tyndale (1525-1530), Coverdale (1535), Matthew (1537), The Great Bible (1539), The Geneva Bible (1560), and The Bishop’s Bible (1568).

When the Imprimatur Douay-Rheims Bible appeared in 1610, it was complete with chapter descriptions and copious notes that instructed Catholics in Church doctrine, as well as in the nuances of acceptable biblical interpretations, including those of ‘old’ testament prophecies about Jews. Such attendant writings not only served as a teaching guide for ecclesiastics who were entrusted with disseminating the truths of Christianity to both the literate and illiterate, they also directed readers of the bible to the ‘hidden meanings’ of the Hebrew scriptures. Not only were titles and paraphrases juxtaposed so that scriptures would not be read apart from them, the Trent decree that forbade interpretation outside of Church tradition was reinforced by readers’ notes, such as the one attendant to *Psalms 118*, which emphasized “the difficulty of understanding the holy scriptures and...with what humility and submission to the Church they [were] to be read.” Instruction toward Church interpretation was then reinforced by content descriptions preceding each chapter, such that - in a most critical sense - the summaries of the ideas said to be contained in the Hebrew texts became an authoritative *part of* the scripture itself. In the case of the doctrine of divinely ordained punishment of Jews, notes and descriptions accompanying the *Psalms*, each of which was said to be an individual storehouse of prophetic utterance by Christ himself, is also a storehouse of teachings against Jews. *Psalms 54*, for example, in Figure 4 below, is said to be the “prayer of a just man under persecution from the wicked, [which] agrees to Christ persecuted by the Jews and betrayed by Judas,” while verse 16 of the same Psalm, “let death come upon them, and let them go down alive into hell,” is accompanied by a note explaining that such imprecations are prophecies “foretelling the punishments that shall fall upon the wicked from divine justice.”

Figure 4. Divine Desolation of Jews: Chapter Descriptions, Douay-Rheims Bible, 1610

<p>Jeremiah</p> <p>8. Other evils that shall fall upon the Jews for their impenitence.</p> <p>12. The desolation of the Jews for their sins.</p> <p>13. Under the figure of a linen girdle is foretold the destruction of the Jews.</p> <p>15. God is determined to punish the Jews for their sins.</p> <p>19. Under the type of breaking a potter's vessel, the prophet foreshows the desolation of the Jews for their sins.</p> <p>Isaiah</p> <p>2. The Jews shall be rejected for their sins.</p> <p>3. The confusion and other evils that shall come upon the Jews for their sins.</p> <p>4. After an extremity of evils that shall fall upon the Jews, a remnant shall be comforted by Christ.</p> <p>5. The reprobation of the Jews is foreshown under the parable of a vineyard.</p> <p>8. Many evils shall come upon the Jews for their sins.</p> <p>50. The synagogue shall be divorced for her iniquities.</p> <p>Ezekiel</p> <p>5. The judgments of God upon the Jews are foreshown under the type of the prophet's hair.</p> <p>7. The final desolation of Israel, from which few shall escape.</p> <p>Amos</p> <p>3. The evils that shall fall upon Israel for their sins.</p> <p>9. The certainty of the desolation of Israel....</p> <p>Hosea</p> <p>3. The wretched state of the Jews for a long time, till at last they shall be converted.</p> <p>Psalms</p> <p>Psalms 54 (55) A prayer of a just man under persecution from the wicked. It agrees to Christ persecuted by the Jews, and betrayed by Judas. <i>54.16 note: This and such like imprecations which occur in the Psalms are delivered prophetically, that is by way of foretelling the punishments which shall fall upon the wicked from divine justice, but not by way of ill will or uncharitable causes, which the law of God disallows.</i></p> <p>Psalms 58 (59) A prayer to be delivered from the wicked, with confidence in God's help and protection. It agrees to Christ and his enemies the Jews.</p> <p>Psalms 68 (69) Christ in his passion declares the greatness of his sufferings, and the malice of his persecutors the Jews; and foretells their reprobation. <i>68.23 note: What here follow in the style of an imprecation is a prophecy of the wretched state to which the Jews shall be reduced in punishment of their willful obstinacy.</i></p>	
---	--

Psalms 58, as another illustration, is said to be “a prayer to be delivered from the wicked...[which] agrees to Christ and his enemies the Jews,” while *Psalms* 68 is said to be “Christ declar[ing] the greatness of his sufferings and the malice of his persecutors the Jews, and foretell[ing] their reprobation.” A note explaining verse 23 of this same Psalm teaches that it is a prophetic

imprecation “of the wretched state to which the Jews shall be reduced in punishment of their willful obstinacy.”

That these 1610 biblical interpretations were representative of the Counter-Reformation position on Jews, and not just an English phenomenon, is made clear by the fourth edition of *De Iudaeis*, a “comprehensive synthesis of Jewry law” published in Latin three years later in Venice. While it is not clear that this handbook for judges of Jewry law was an official papal work, it is clear that *De Iudaeis* was first published with Pope Paul IV’s sanction three years after he issued *Cum nimis*, and the 1613 fourth edition still bore the original 1558 dedication to him.¹⁹ Moreover, the underlying theme of the work - the Church is “the True Israel” and Jews, “once the favored people of God,” are “now His enemies” - is clearly a reflection of the theology informing not only *Cum nimis* but the post-Trent Douay Rheims Bible.

As the only privileged *infidels* among the triad of God’s enemies (Jews, heretics, and pagans), Jews are described in *De Iudaeis* as tolerated and sustained in a “state of punishment” that renders them dependent upon the charity of Christianity for any societal privileges. This “dependent status,” in turn, was said to “demand subjection of Judaism to Christianity” and, by extension, of Jews to Christians. Indeed, according to Kenneth Stow’s analysis, the “necessary inferiority of the Jew to the Christian” is the key to understanding this first encompassing work on Jewry laws.²⁰ The principle echoing throughout the work is that Christianity is insulted and stained “whenever the Jew becomes the Christian’s superior.”²¹ Such was said to be the case

¹⁹ Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy*, 63-71. *De Iudaeis*, by Marquardus de Susannis, first published in 1558 with editions in 1584, 1601, and 1613, was the first work of its kind. It contained some 300 pages, two thirds of which were devoted to a synthesis of Jewry laws and the remainder to traditional polemical arguments that could be used to “convince Jews and other infidels to embrace Christianity.”

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 91-96; 80-81. Jews, who were the only ‘infidels’ privileged to receive the toleration and protection of the Church, are described as religious enemies sustained in a state of punishment to remind Christians of divine justice and allow them to see firsthand the antecedent form of Christianity.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 96.

whether in legal decisions concerning clothing, medical matters, servants, conversation, construction of synagogues, dining at a Jew's table, or even usury and sexual relations.²² In general, any Jewish behavior or any Christian relationship with a Jew which made it appear that Jews were superior to Christians was an affront and a 'molestation' of the Church. This "prohibition of insult" was central to the overall code of Jewry laws and each particular law "clarified and reinforced" the central prohibition. Sexual relations with Jews, for example, were not "a crime in and of themselves" but, rather, the relations were prohibited because they were an insult to Christianity. The interdependency of these laws was reflected in specific clothing requirements for Jews, which not only identified Jews as those unworthy of sexual encounters but also classified Jews as Christian inferiors. Indeed, the stipulated ignominious clothing of the Jew was said to serve as a constant "visual reminder" that, precisely because of his crimes against Christ and Church, the Jew was a slave while the Christian was free. Such penal theology extended even to the "unassailable right of Jews to Justice," for, while justice was indeed said to exist for Jews, it was never seen as *equal* justice but, rather, justice specific to the divinely imposed inferior standing of Jews. The same held true in the case of privileges, for *if* Jews were to enjoy equality of privileges, then the integrity of those 'hidden biblical truths' of Christian dominance, Jewish subservience, and perpetual Jewish punishment and suffering would clearly be brought into question.²³

Any attempt to amend or end this Christendom-wide condition of Jews was seen as a contradiction of Christian truth. As expressed two centuries later in English debates over Jewish emancipation, "to admit [Jews] to the rights of citizens [would be] to manifestly insult the Divine

²² Ibid., 72-124.

²³ Ibid., 94-99.

oracles.”²⁴ The problem continually exercising Christendom - how to tolerate the perpetual enemy while subduing his influence and keeping him in his divinely imposed place of subservience - had indeed taken on a modern face in the period between the 1613 edition of the Catholic *De Iudaeis* and this 1831 Protestant statement, but the fundamental tenets of argument, as understood by Lord Thomas Macaulay here, remained unchanged.

- 1) Existing laws which limit Jewish rights and powers are vindication for their acts against Christ.
- 2) The scriptures are “full of terrible denunciations against the Jews...it is foretold that they are to be wanderers... it is foretold that they are to be oppressed... to admit them to the rights of citizens is manifestly to insult the divine oracles.”
- 3) It would be “monstrous” for Jews to legislate a Christian community.
- 4) It would be “most shocking” for a Jew to act as judge in a Christian country, an “abomination not to be thought of among baptized people.”
- 5) It would be “impious” for a Jew to sit in Parliament, “a profanation sufficient to bring ruin on the country.”
- 6) It would be an “eternal disgrace to the nation” for a Jew to be a councilor to a Christian king.
- 7) “It is our duty as Christians to exclude the Jews from political power,” and “secure ourselves from danger.”
- 8) The precepts governing England are essentially Christian; admitting Jews to public office would therefore destroy the Christian foundations of England.
- 9) English Jews are not Englishmen; while they live locally in England, “they are a separate people” who are morally and politically in international communion.
- 10) English Jews have a “deadly hatred” for England; in their synagogues they call down curses on London and blessings on “those who would dash our children to pieces.”

Nothing had changed by the nineteenth century, in other words, and yet everything had changed. The sixteenth century disintegration of a unified Christianity, its ensuing religiously inspired wars, the 1555 division of German states according to the religion of each sovereign ruler, and the 1618 Thirty Years War that divided not only the Holy Roman Empire but much of Europe along religious lines, had all given rise to sentiments that, in one way or another began to

²⁴ Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay, “Civil Disabilities of the Jews,” *Edinburgh Review* (1831), reprinted in *Critical Essays Contributed to the Edinburgh Review*, 5th ed., Vol.1, (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1848), www.oll.libertyfund.org. Macaulay’s essay is a form of his speech to Parliament a few months earlier in 1830 which he outlined current arguments against Jews in order to refute them.

meld the ideas of Christianity, people, country, and national identity.²⁵ As Christianity fragmented throughout Europe, regional and national sensibilities contracted into multiple senses of Christian statehood or nationhood and, along with this transformation, centuries of Christian teachings about the alleged Jewish threat to the foundations of Christendom were gradually transformed into claims about the Jewish threat to the foundations of specific states and nations.

Whether or not it was Luther who set the model for turning traditional Christian arguments into nationalistic arguments against Jews, it is clear that his joining of 'being Christian' to that of 'being German' helped to clear the path. It was in sixteenth century England, however, not Germany, where conditions and sentiments first coalesced into the idea of a unified Christian 'nation' to which one belonged, to which one owed allegiance, and by which one would henceforth be identified.²⁶ Yet it did not come about without dissent, for being known as 'English' rather than 'Christian,' owing one's first allegiance to England rather than Christ, and placing emphasis on being part of the body of Englishers rather than the body of Christ, argued Sir Thomas More, was to usurp both the authority and unity of Christendom. Unlike Luther, who seemed to be arguing that 'being Christian' was a necessary attribute of 'being German,' the strongly Catholic More argued unsuccessfully that 'being English' was a contingent attribute of 'being Christian.' And it was on such grounds that he, the King's Lord Chancellor, dissented when the English clergy formalized Henry VIII as the supreme head of the English church in May

²⁵ The 1555 Peace of Augsburg, for example, determined the religion of the German states according to the principle *cujus regio illius et religio* (the lord of the land shall be also lord of the religion) but it did not quell religious controversy and war. Other fragmentation leading to national sensibilities occurred with the rise of state churches, the formation of European Protestant Unions and Catholic Leagues, and the Thirty Years War, which erupted on religious principle and quickly escalated into multiple national aggressions between 1618-1648.

²⁶ Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 29-31. More's view carried him to the gallows for treason on July 16, 1535.

of 1532. Yet More's concern was clearly a minority view, says Liah Greenfeld, for by 1600 an English national consciousness and identity which superseded Christian identity was "a fact."

Still, it was not the case that all traditional Christian arguments against Jews were translated into nationalistic arguments in England, or that, once they began to be nationalized, traditional arguments were abandoned. As evidenced by Anglican bishop Richard Kidder's 1690 treatise, "A Demonstration of the Messiah, in which the Truth of the Christian Religion is Proved Against All Enemies But Especially the Jews," the gradual development of nationalistic claims against Jews neither eliminated nor hampered the claim that Jews remained a persistent threat to Christendom.²⁷ Christian claims about Jewish threats to Christianity had indeed been transformed into nationalistic arguments in England by the time that Macaulay argued for Jewish civil rights before Parliament in 1830, but arguments against Jews, both before and after Macaulay's speech and essay, also continued to invoke traditional warnings. A traceable difference between the two modes of argument is that the traditional form - which in Kidder's 1690 essay inveighs against Jews as "under-workmen" of heretical Deists who threaten the foundations of Christian truth - moves more to the rear over time as a backup to the modern invoking of nationalistic concerns.

Other traditional arguments against Jews were undergoing changes as well. It does not come about all at once, or even in *toto*, but as enlightenment ideas tighten their grip on the language of slavery and servitude, one begins to see a resurrection of ancient Christian language that describes punishment and perpetual suffering of Jews as a divine curse placed upon them. A striking form of this refocused argument appears in Gotthold Lessing's 1749 play, *Die Juden*, which reproduces in dramatic format the current beliefs rooted in European understanding of Jews. The traditional subservience claims retain their ancient format here - it is "in accordance with the Bible" when Christians are in dominion over Jews and an insult to all of Christendom

²⁷ Michael Marissen, "Handel, Messiah, and the Jews," *Swarthmore College Bulletin* (September 2007), and "Unsettling History of that Joyous 'Hallelujah,'" *New York Times*, April 8, 2007.

when any Jew is in a position of dominance over Christians - but without emphasis on subservience as a special kind of penal suffering.²⁸ Instead, the case is made that Jews are divinely cursed with perpetual suffering because of their crimes against society, such as thieving and cheating. As Lessing's Christian character points out - repeating his pastor's recent sermon - "They are a people accursed by God... If the Good Lord did not hate them, why did almost twice as many Jews as Christians perish in the recent disaster in Breslau?"²⁹

The highest ranking Catholic of the time also pointed out the 'reality' of the condition of Jews, howbeit in the traditional language of slavery and servitude. In a 1751 bull, which reviews the historical suppression of Jewish influence in Christian Poland, Pope Benedict XIV reminds the Primate, Archbishop, and Bishops of Poland that both Pope Innocent III (in *Etsi Judaeas*, 1205) and Pope Paul IV (in *Cum nimis*, 1555) had formally decreed the "truth of the matter" about Jews.³⁰

It is fitting for Jews to serve Christians, but not for Christians to serve Jews. On the contrary, Jews, as slaves rejected by that Savior whose death they wickedly contrived, should recognize themselves in fact and in creed the slaves of those whom the death of Christ has set free.

This reminder was issued by Pope Benedict because "experts in Polish affairs" had alerted the Roman See that Jews in Poland were displacing Christian populations, purchasing

²⁸ Gottfried Ephraim Lessing, *Die Juden* (1749), as discussed in Alex Bein, *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*, translated by Harry Zohn (London and Toronto: Herzl Press and Fairleigh Dickinson University press, 1990), 177, 542-543. Like Lord Macaulay some seventy years later, Lessing reproduced current claims against Jews in order to appeal to their absurdity.

²⁹ Ibid, 177. Other Protestant versions of divinely Jewish suffering in this period can be seen in John Wesley's standard *Notes on the Old Testament* (1765-66), where he teaches, for example, that the breaking of the potter's vessel in *Jeremiah XIX* foreshows the desolation of the Jews. See also John Newton (author of "Amazing Grace"), *Sermons on Handel's Messiah* (1784), where the same teaching takes the form: "the Jewish nation have behaved most stubbornly against Christ and cruelly against Christians, and God's judgments are come upon them."

³⁰ Pope Benedict XIV, *A Quo Primum*, To the Primate, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Kingdom of Poland, June 14, 1751. *Papal Encyclicals Online*, www.papalencyclicals.net/Ben14baqo.htm.

bankrupt estates, farmlands, and inns, as well as gaining control of liquor and wine sales in certain towns and cities. Moreover, the expert had said, Christians were working in Jewish businesses and households, publicly intermingling, and loaning money to Jews, and Jews were in turn using the money to make commercial profits that were later loaned back to Christians at an “exorbitant” rate of interest. Such Jewish “excesses,” Benedict complained, rendered Christians “submissive to [Jewish] will and power” and allowed Jews to influence Christians and “flaunt authority,” both of which are divinely forbidden. In making his case that Jews were to serve as “eminent [Christian] reminders ...while they pay the just penalties for [their] great crime,”³¹ the Pope made clear that it was the responsibility of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to renew and enforce papal sanctions on this matter, as well as to teach by example “the right way to act” toward Jews. He also added that, when the need arose, the Holy See “[would] cooperate energetically and effectively...to remove this stain of shame from Poland.”³²

Running parallel to the Holy See’s attempt to suppress Jewish influence and remove stain from Poland, a modern version of the Christian teaching that casts Jews as the preeminent hating enemy of Christendom was being debuted in central Europe. In 1756 from Geneva and again in 1764 from Basle, widely-discussed French Voltaire attributed to Jews “the most invincible hatred for every people by whom they are tolerated and enriched.” This claim, made in the context of

³¹ Ibid, Pope Benedict XIV, *A Quo Primum*. To make his case, Pope Benedict called up teachings and restrictions from twelfth century churchmen and rulers, sanctions from the 1167 Council of Breslau, which, did all it “could do to aid the Poles in their resistance to Jews,” and restrictive decrees issued by Popes Alexander III (1159-1181), Nicholas IV (1288-1292), Pius V (1566-1572), Gregory XIII (1572-1585), Clement VIII (1592- 1605), each of whom sought to reduce the ‘Jewish threat’ to Christians and Christianity. Among the preachers invoked, Benedict posits the “famous monk Radaulph” as one “so inflamed against the Jews that he traversed Germany and France in the twelfth century, preaching against them as enemies of our holy religion, incit[ing] Christians to destroy them.” Without repudiating such actions, the Pope asks the ecclesiastical hierarchy to consider what Radaulph would think “if he were now alive and saw what was happening in Poland?”

³² Ibid. Those “recalcitrant” to learning the right way to act toward Jews, e.g., as divinely rejected slaves of those whom Christ had set free, were to be censured, and harsher measures were to be applied to those whose failure to do so endangered ecclesiastical discipline or salvation of souls.

charging Jews with perceiving themselves as “the enemies of all men,” not only modernized the traditional church teaching that posited Jews as the preeminent haters of Christ, Christianity, and humanity, it also advanced the *causal* sequence of that teaching by positing that Jews “hold in abhorrence all other nations” and are in turn “abhorred by men.”³³ Yet this ‘nationalizing’ of alleged Jewish hatred and its alleged causal effect did not displace the traditional Christian form of the same argument. While such claims against Jews do begin to appear more and more frequently in the context of Jewish hatred for specific peoples after Voltaire, they do not appear as a replacement of the older version. What is found instead is that the two forms, alarmingly, now begin to co-exist in mutual interdependence, each as a part of the other’s intrinsically-implied meaning.

As illustrated by Lessing’s *Die Juden*, the case for justification of reciprocal hatred for Jews had already begun to shift away from emphasis on Jewish crimes against God and Christianity to Jewish crimes against particular societies and nations. Johann David Michaelis, a theologian at Goettingen and pioneer in the new biblical criticism, for example, followed such a trend to explain reciprocal hatred of Jews when he argued in a review of Lessing’s play in the 1780s that “virtue and honesty is found among [Jews] so seldom” that its few scattered instances do nothing to reduce public hatred of Jews, adding in a later argument that Jews are “twenty five times as harmful...as other inhabitants of Germany.”³⁴ Such currents of arguments about Jewish hatred for others (and others’ hatred for Jews) were so common at the time in discussions of civil rights for Jews that a German scholar of constitutional law, Christen Wilhelm von Dohm,

³³ Francois-Marie Arouet de Voltaire, “Jews,” *Ouevres Completes* (Geneva, 1756) and *Dictionnaire Philosophique* (Basle, 1764), trans. William F. Fleming (1904), in *The Jew in the Modern World*, 252-253.

³⁴ Johann David Michaelis, Review of *Die Juden*, *Goettingen Gelehrter Anzeiger*, in Bein, 543, no date cited. “Arguments Against Dohm” originally appeared in *Orientalische und Exgetische Bibliothek* 19 (1782) and was reprinted by Dohm in *ueber die buergerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (Berline & Stettin, 1783), trans. L. Sachs, *The Jew in the Modern World*, 36-38.

presented them as barriers to be demolished in the minds of non-Jewish Europeans before equality for Jews could prevail.³⁵ As Dohm outlined in 1783, public claims about Jewish hatred involved all three dimensions of time - the past (the “fanatic hatred with which Jews persecuted the founder of Christianity has been transmitted to their posterity”), the present (Jews harbor “a bitter hatred of all who do not belong to their tribe”), and a warning for the future (“outbreaks of [Jewish] hatred ...often [occur] unless [Jews are] held in check by force.”)³⁶

Indeed, holding Jews in check became the mantra of those arguing the dangers of Jewish emancipation throughout Germany. Helping this along was the term *Judenthum*, which, since used by Luther in his New Testament translation to denote the dual role of Jews in the Judaizing party that opposed God's truth and the persecutor of God's church, had not been without negative connotations.³⁷ According to Paul Lawrence Rose, as the term settled more and more in the German language during and after the Reformation, *Judenthum* was used with alternating fluency to describe ‘Judaism,’ the religion, ‘Jewry,’ the nation or community, and ‘Jewishness,’ the alleged traits and mentalities peculiar to Jews.³⁸ The escalating use of one word to describe all three aspects of Jewish existence allowed for such conflation that Judaism, Jews, and their alleged traits could be discussed as if they were one collective package. As Rose observes, such

³⁵ Christian Wilhelm von Dohm, *Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews* (1781), *The Jew in the Modern World*, 27-34. In arguing for civil rights for Jews Dohm turned the traditional claim of Jewish hatred around, arguing that “if [the Jew] feels antipathy and hatred against the Christian...then all this is our doing,” since it is caused by the severe oppression resulting from the “fanatical religious hatred” of Christianity in past centuries.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 29-31.

³⁷ Not only did Luther's negative usage of *Judentum* in *Galatians* become part of the 'truth' of scripture itself, his scriptural rendering became part of the definition of *Judentum*. As illustrated by Grimm's *Deutsches Woerterbuch*, first published in 1854 and considered one of the most important German dictionaries, German readers are actually referred to Luther's translation of *Galatians* 1.13-14 as part of the lexical definition of *Judentum*.

³⁸ Paul Lawrence Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany From Kant to Wagner* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990), xvii-xviii, 33-35; *Wagner: Race and Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 2-5.

polyvalence allowed German authors “to fluctuate ambiguously and easily between speaking of Jews as metaphors and as real people,” leaving the way open for the reader to “respond intellectually and emotionally to as many meanings of *Judentum* as he want[ed].”

The potency of this carefully placed word to deliver layers of inherited Christian teachings on Jews and Judaism comes into focus when considering the historical transmission of claims about alleged Jewish hatred. The ancient Christian idea of Jews being a ‘nation of haters,’ or as was often said, of “possessing a specifically hateful national character,” was not only subsumed as a layer of ever-thickening meaning of *Judenthum*, it was eventually advanced as a central meaning around which all other denotations and connotations of the term pivoted.³⁹ This becomes especially clear in the historical and philosophical critiques of Jews and Judaism by German academicians in the Enlightenment period, beginning with Johann Eisenmenger, an orientalist at University of Heidelberg. With a characterization of Jews as preeminent haters for his starting point, Eisenmenger compiled a two volume tome of alleged documentations of such in the early eighteenth century, entitling it *Entdecktes Judenthum*. The title’s English translation, *Judaism Exposed* (or unmasked), however, fails to capture the essence of the work, for, while it is indeed based on Eisenmenger’s interpretation of Judaism’s literature, the double-edged theme portrayed throughout is the exposure of alleged Jewish hatred, and the ways in which the Jewish ‘bitter enemy’ inflicts that hatred on Christian society.⁴⁰

³⁹ Ibid., xvii, 10-11, 34, 61-64.

⁴⁰ Johann Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum, the original and true account of the ways in which the stubborn Jews frightfully blaspheme and dishonor the Holy Trinity, revile the Holy Mother of Christ mockingly criticize the New Testament, the evangelists, the apostles, and Christian religion, and despise and curse to the uttermost extreme the whole of Christianity*. The first edition (2500 copies) was printed in 1699 but publication was suppressed after Jews appealed to the emperor that it would incite violence against Jews. Subsequent to Eisenmenger’s death in 1704, his relatives intervened and convinced the King of Prussia to allow publication of 3000 additional copies at Koenigsburg in 1711. German text, judaica-frankfurt.de/content/titleinfo/260406. English translation by Franz Xaver Schiefferl (Dresden, 1893), selections in Richard S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World*, 31-39. See also Alex Bein, *Jewish Question*, 184-186, 558; John Weis, *Ideology of Death*, 31-32; Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism*, 8-9.

This alleged national characteristic of *Judenthum* was also at the center of Immanuel Kant's philosophical critique of Judaism. In a section entitled "Victory of the Good Over the Evil Principle" in the last major work of his life (1793), he distinguished between *der juedische Glaube* (the Jewish faith) and *Judenthum* to make the common points that neither stand in any "essential connection whatever" to Christianity and that are a religion. *Der juedische Glaube* in its original form, Kant argues, was "a collection of mere statutory laws upon which was established a political organization," and what has come to be called *Judenthum* "is merely a union of ...people who...belonged to a particular stock [and] formed themselves into a commonwealth under purely political laws." The Jewish intention from the start was to be a "state" and not a religion, Kant insisted, as evidenced by its lack of precepts espousing universality, which any belief system emanating from a moral Being would possess.⁴¹ Instead of being a religion, he argued, *Judenthum* is a theocracy that "boasts of instructions imparted directly by God" while espousing an exclusivity that displays "enmity toward all other peoples." An enmity, he adds, that, in turn, "evoke[s] the enmity of all."⁴²

If Kant's thesis that *Judenthum* is a state grounded in the principle of hatred was not explicit enough, then Johann Gottlieb Fichte's surely was a few months later when he announced that "a powerful, hostilely disposed nation is infiltrating almost every country in Europe." Drawing on Kant's argument that Judaism is not a moral religion, indeed, not a religion at all, but

⁴¹ Immanuel Kant, *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft* (Koenigsberg, 1793-94); online at Google Books. For English translation see *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone*, by Theodore M. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), 149-154 (German), 116-118 (English). Kant also complains that Judaism's commands are coercive laws that relate wholly to external acts rather than emphasizing the development of moral disposition, and that the consequential rewards and punishments associated with Judaism's systems of laws are related to the present world rather than to belief in an afterlife.

⁴² Ibid. In another passage Kant speaks of *Judaismus*, which "drew down upon itself the charge of *Menschenhasse* (misanthropy);" 221(German), 172 (English). In *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, a minor work written and published 1796-1798, Kant turns to 'national characteristics' again by referring to Jews as a nation of deceivers living among us who "do not seek any civil honor" but seek "to compensate their loss by profitably outwitting the very people among whom they find protection;" 101.

a collection of Jews stamped with the characteristic of hatred for all other peoples and organized around the political idea of a nation, Fichte sets out to demonstrate that

the Jewish Nation [*das Judenthum*] is dreadful not because it is isolated and closely-knit, but rather because it is founded on the hatred of mankind.

Warning against the dangers of allowing “states within the state,” Jews are depicted as a nation of haters who are enemies of the state because they refuse to accept the sovereignty of the state. As part of this, Fichte goes on to modernize a long-standing Christian belief about the adversarial nature of Jews by claiming that the Jewish Nation “is in a state of perpetual war” with “almost every country in Europe.”⁴³ All of these elements, as put forth by both Kant and Fichte, says Paul Lawrence Rose, took the shape of an Enlightenment portrait of *Judenthum* as “the worse of all reactionary forces blocking emergence of a moral free European man,” and it was accepted with “virtually unquestioning support in German culture.”⁴⁴

That this was the case becomes more clear in the early decades of the nineteenth century with the rise of the ‘Jewish Question.’ Although public discussion of how Jews fit into the European emancipation picture was not confined to the German press, Jacob Toury reports that “the case for and especially against the Jews” seems to have been more widely argued in the German language than any other.⁴⁵ After Napoleon’s defeat and the 1814-15 Congress of Vienna’s division of some three hundred German states into a Confederation of thirty-eight loosely joined conservative sovereignties, calls for equality and civil rights, representative

⁴³ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums ueber die Franzoeische Revolution* (1793), trans. M. Gelber, *The Jew in the Modern World*, 257-58. German text at zeno.org/Philosophie/M/Fichte,+Johann+Gottlieb. He was appointed resident Kantian philosopher at University of Jena in the fall of 1793 after this two hundred page work was published.

⁴⁴ Rose, *Race and Revolution*, 7-11.

⁴⁵ Toury, “The Jewish Question: A Semantic Approach,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* XI (1966), 86-7.

government, and German national unity began to appear more and more frequently.⁴⁶ Along with this, Toury notes, language used to argue against Jewish emancipation began to appear in more generalized forms. In the early 1820s, for example, while one pamphlet was circulating to inform the German public that *Judenthum* intended to use literary and journalistic activities “to establish a full dominion over the world of ideas,” another was put into circulation which asked the general question *Was ist anzufangen mit den Juden?* (What is to be done with the Jews?). By 1838 two long essays had appeared that categorized such concerns as “the Jewish question (*die juedische Frage*),” and by 1842 at least five published works, all of them against equality for Jews, bore the newly coined word *die Judenfrage*. Two of these works, Johann Hoffmann's “Zur Judenfrage,” in *Allgemeine Preussische Staats-Zeitung*, and Bruno Bauer's “Die Judenfrage,” in *Deutsche Jahrbucher fuer Wissenschaft und Kunst*, which were reedited and republished as separate booklets the following year, ignited a widespread controversy that, says Jacob Toury, turned ‘the Jewish question’ into a household word.⁴⁷

Bruno Bauer (1809-1882), a theologian-philosopher who believed that Eisenmenger's work on the Jews “had yet to be refuted,” played a critical role in this.⁴⁸ Bauer argued against

⁴⁶ See David Kertzer, *The Popes Against the Jews*, 29-41, for an example of a non-publicly argued case for re-suppression of Jews after they had been freed from the ghettos of the Papal States by Napoleon's army. When the French regime collapsed in 1814, the ghettos were once again closed and the Inquisition was reestablished. Pope Pius VIII's (1800-1823) reasoning at the time was that it was the church's duty “to treat Jews as forever degraded, perpetually condemned for the killing of Christ.” His successor Pope Leo XII (1823-29) also held that Jews were to remain “confined to their divinely assigned place.”

⁴⁷ See Ludolf Holst, *Das Judentum in allen dessen Theilen* (Mainz, 1821); V. Buenau, *Was ist anzufangen mit den Juden* (1822); “Die judische Frage,” in *Muenchener Historisch-Politische Blaetter fuer das katholische Deutschland*, Vol.ii (1838); “Beitraege zur Loesung der juedischen Frage (1938),” in *Deutsche Viertel-Jahresschrift*, I (1938), “Zur Judenfrage,” Johann G. Hoffman, in *Allgemeine Preussische Staats-Zeitung* (Berlin 1842), *Die Judenfrage*, Aus den Papieren eines Berliner Buergers (Berlin 1842). „Die Presse und die Judenfrage,” Priv. *Berlinische Zeitung* (1842), „Die Judenfrage in Preussen, Theodor Brand (Breslau 1842), “Die Judenfrage,” Bruno Bauer, *Deutsche Jahrbuecher fuer Wissenschaft und Kunst*, vol.v (1842); Toury 90-93.

⁴⁸ Bruno Bauer, who studied under Schleiermacher and Hegel at University of Berlin lectured in theology and biblical criticism at Berlin from 1834-1839 and at Bonn from 1839-1842. His political journalism between 1842-1849 was followed by further work in biblical criticism, for which he was later hailed by

emancipation of Jews on the grounds that that no one in Germany was politically emancipated, that Germans had to emancipate themselves, and that Jews could expect to be included only if they abandoned their idea of *Judenthum*.⁴⁹ The whole point of political emancipation was to eliminate the practices of exclusivity and privileges in favor of equality, Bauer argued, yet Jews clung to religious tradition based on “exclusiveness, the idea of a special [Jewish] mission, [and] ultimate domination (*Alleinherrschaft*).” Such unrelenting Jewish tenacity not only “renders [Jewish] emancipation impossible,” he warned, it demonstrates “most clearly the strength of *Judenthum*.”⁵⁰

Karl Marx (1818-1883) agreed with Bauer about the strength of *Judenthum* but his overall thesis in *Zur Judenfrage* the following year (1844) was constructed on the grounds that Bauer had wrongly framed the Jewish Question as a religious category. Both Bauer’s *Die Judenfrage* and *The Capacity of Christians and Jews to Become Free*, which stressed the irreconcilable opposition of Christianity and Judaism, Marx argued, were wrong headed analyses for it was not the case that Judaism and Christianity were opposites.⁵¹ While appearances indeed

Friedrich Engels in 1882. In addition to *Die Judenfrage* and *The Capacity of Present Day Christians and Jews to Become Free*, both of which drew on Johann Eisenmenger’s *Entdecktes Judenthum*, Bauer also published *Das Entdeckte Christenthum* (Christianity Unmasked) in 1843, a critique of Christianity modeled on Eisenmenger’s work. See Nathan Rotenstreich “For and Against Emancipation: The Bruno Bauer Controversy,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* IV (1959), 3-36; Douglas Moggach, “Bruno Bauer,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*; Harold Green, Review, *The Philosophy and Politics of Bruno Bauer* by Douglas Moggach (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), *Dialogue* (April 2005), 94-96; Paul Lawrence Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism*, esp. 263-278; Toury 97-98.

⁴⁹ Bruno Bauer, *The Jewish Question*, trans. by Michael Malloy, *The Young Hegelians: An Anthology*, introduced and edited by Lawrence S. Stepelovich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 187-197.

⁵⁰ Ibid. Bauer also argued that Jews themselves brought on the historical oppression they suffered because they incessantly struggled to overcome the Christian world, see translation in *The Jew in the Modern World*, 322, and Toury, 97.

⁵¹ This war of words was taking place in a period when calls for reform were heralded throughout the continent by way of traditional press as well as newly established liberal presses. Freedom of the press, as a necessary part of free society, was part of the call for reform, and a debate on the issue broke out in Prussia in 1842 just after Marx received his doctorate from the University of Jena. In response to a Prussian citizen

pointed to separation and opposition between the two, the reality of the matter was that the “practical Jewish spirit...[had] perpetuated itself in Christian society and attained its highest development there.” Although it was true that Christianity had emerged from Judaism, Marx argued, it was also true that “from the start, the Christian was the theorizing Jew” and “the Jew was the practical Christian,” with the result that “Christianity is the sublime thought of Judaism” and “Judaism is the vulgar practical application of Christianity.” Instead of universal Christianity being an opposing force, in other words, it had merely served as a vehicle through which *Judenthum* expressed itself, eventually attaining “universal domination” by turning “alienated man and alienated nature into *alienable*, saleable objects in thrall to egoistic need and huckstering.” In mistakenly trying to find “the secret of the Jew in his religion” instead of looking for “the secret of the religion in actual Jews,” Marx goes on, Bauer had failed to see that *Judenthum* was far more than a religious category or a German social problem. It was more correctly, he insisted, a “universal *anti-social* element,” which, in its present stage of historical development, had already permeated the entire western world with its egoistic, materialistic spirit. Moreover, he insisted, Bauer had failed to understand the Jewish question itself. By insisting that Jews could not be emancipated until they freed themselves from *Judenthum*, Bauer had failed to grasp that the Jewish problem is *not* the emancipation of Jews from the bonds of European society, but “the emancipation of mankind from *Judenthum*.”⁵²

being charged with treason for publishing a pamphlet calling for a democratic constitution, he attacked Prussian censorship in the February 1842 *Deutsche Jahrbuecher*. His attacks continued in a series of related articles on the liberation of society in Cologne’s *Rheinsche Zeitung* until the newspaper was banned by the Prussian government in April of 1843. With its closing, Marx moved to Paris where he launched the short-lived political journal *Deutsch-Franzoesische Jahrbuecher*, publishing in the one and only February 1844 issue his “Zur Judenfrage.” Part I is a critique of Bauer’s *Die Judenfrage*, and Part II is a critique of Bauer’s “*Die Faehigkeit der heutigen Juden und Christen, frei zu werden*.”

⁵² Karl Marx, “On The Jewish Question,” in *Karl Marx, Early Writings*, Translated and Edited by T.B. Bottomore (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), 34-39. For online German text of *Zur Judenfrage*, see www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/jewish-question. See also Paul Lawrence Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism*, 296-305; Toury, 99-100; Rotenstreich, 23-27.

Where Bauer and Marx were in agreement - and where the *Judenthum-Judenfrage* relation more or less rested for the remainder of the decade - was in their insistence that it was *Judenthum* in its complex of layered threats to society that constituted *die Judenfrage*. Whether *Judenthum* was an unrelenting religious force based on exclusiveness and the goal of religious domination, as Bauer said, or a universal antisocial element that permeated Christianized western culture with the Jewish spirit, turning Christians into Jews, as Marx said, both agreed and argued that it was a powerful and destructive force as yet uncontained in German society.

Richard Wagner was working as *Kapellmeister* at the Royal State Opera in Dresden, Saxony, when he first learned in February of 1848 that the long anticipated European wide revolution for social reform had erupted. Dresden itself was not overcome until May 3, 1849, but when it was, Wagner, owing to eager participation in demonstrations, manning of barricades, and armed resistance, was forced to flee as the city fell to advancing Saxon troops. By early July he was in Zurich with 'revolutionary' pen in hand, writing the first of four related works depicting the Jew as the destroyer of culture. Published in Leipzig before the month was over, "Art and Revolution" depicted the state of modern western culture as a reflection of the "golden calf of wholesale speculation... enervating, demoralizing, and dehumanizing everything on which it sheds its venom." In stark contrast to this 'golden-calf force' was "total being," which he described the following January in *Artwork of the Future* as an artistic force capable of freeing the west of its "sickly money-soul." This idea of two opposing currents of cultural influence appeared again in "Art and Climate" two months later, where he portrayed the 'golden-calf' force as forever intent on the destruction of "total being," the only "true" culture available to mankind.⁵³ By early September his anonymously published *Das Judenthum in der Musik* was

⁵³ Richard Wagner, *My Life*, I, 392-463; *Art and Revolution*, *Richard Wagner's Prose Works*, Vol. 1, 42-44; unsigned review of *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, *Anthropological Review*, Vol.7, No.26 (Jul.1869),

advancing this cultural theory with the claim that the ‘soul-destroying golden-calf spirit,’ thriving like a “swarming colony of worms” under the guise of German culture, had already reaped harvest on the ‘soul-enhancing’ force of Germany.⁵⁴

Wagner offered this theory of opposing cultural forces on the strength of what he called “peoples’ instinctive dislike of Jewishness.” As Germans moved toward their own emancipation they indeed recognized Jewish assimilation, he pointed out, but only as a kind of “pretended liberalism” grounded in the shame they felt for their “involuntary revulsion” to everything Jewish. Such pretences had produced no concrete examples of German willingness for contact with Jews, nor had they dampened the German “deep seated involuntary feeling of repugnance for Jewish nature.”⁵⁵ Indeed, he argued, this persistent German revulsion for all things Jewish was proof enough that Germans knew instinctually that which was not understood consciously: that German society had become more and more permeated with Jewishness rather than the other way round. The same liberal attitudes that had voiced approval of Jewish assimilation had given Jewish artists access to German society, and Jews had learned by mimicry to look and sound as if they were Germans partaking of and contributing to German culture. But this was only feigned appearance, he went on, for ‘true German being’ could only be accessed through the “faithful, loving contemplation” of the German people and culture, and the only people and culture that Jews had ever loved were Jewish. Rather than advancing and enriching German culture with

306-309; Robert Giddings, “Wagner and the Revolutionaries,” *Music & Letters*, Vol.45, No.4 (Oct.1964), 348-358; Eric Sams, “Eduard Hanslick, 1825-1904: The perfect Anti-Wagnerite,” *The Musical Times*, Vol.116, No.1592 (Oct.1975), 867-868; Roger Hollinrake, “The Darker Side of Genius: Richard Wagner’s Anti-Semitism by Jacob Katz,” *Music & Letters*, Vol.69., No. 1 (Jan.1988), 92-95; James Treadwell, “The ‘Ring’ and the Conditions of Interpretation: Wagner’s Writings, 1848 to 1852,” *Cambridge Opera Journal*, Vol.7, No.3 (Nov.1995), 207-231; Marc A. Weiner, *Richard Wagner and the Anti-Semitic Imagination* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 209-215.

⁵⁴ Richard Wagner, *Das Judentum in der Musik* (1850), *Richard Wagner: Stories & Essays*, 23-39, quotation on 38-39.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 24, 26, where he makes a similar but broader claim “Whatever European nationality we belong to, [Jews are seen as] something unpleasantly foreign to that nationality.”

Germanness, Wagner insisted, Jewish artists working in German lands had inundated German culture with Jewishness.⁵⁶

The alleged intention of Jews to Judaize had always been a persuasive German argument, but it was particularly so in the Emancipation debates because, as Wagner argued in his essay, the ghetto walls were down and the safety devise that long separated Jews from Christians no longer protected against Jewish influence.⁵⁷ In order to elaborate the resulting Judaization that allegedly occurred when opportunity was added to intent, Wagner moved between usage of old familiar words - *Judenthum*, *Juden* (Jews), *juedisch* (Jewish), *Judenschaft* (body of Jews) - and a newly coined word, *Verjudung*, which can be translated literally as ‘Judaization.’ This newly invented word not only assisted *Judenthum* with the burden of describing and explaining the alleged threatening senses of Jewish influence, it provided a more categorically-specific word with which to point the finger at Jews and speak of both the Jewish *modus operandi* (*verjuden*) and the finished societal product (*Verjudung*).⁵⁸ Such expose was critical, Wagner urged, so that Germans could garner the strength necessary for a “war of liberation” from Jewish cultural dominion. “What we hate in the Jewish character must be revealed to us, and when we know it we can take measures against it. By revealing him clearly, we may hope to wipe the demon from the field, where he has been able to thrive under the protective cover of darkness.”⁵⁹

The backlash from this anonymous essay was swift. According to Wagner some nineteen years later, he was quickly identified as the author and “savage[ly] persecut[ed]” by the Jewish

⁵⁶ Ibid, 31-32.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 26-38. Wagner argued that Jewish destruction of German culture could not have occurred before the time of Mozart (1756-1791) and Beethoven (1712-1773) because “there were no Jewish composers to be found.”

⁵⁸ Ibid, 27, 27-34, 38. For example, “*die Verjudung der modernen Kunst zu befraetigen* (“modern art has been taken over by the Jews).”

⁵⁹ Ibid., 24-26, 23-39.

press. Wagner used the alleged persecution, however, to enlarge on the theme of Jewish domination in a second edition of *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, nearly doubling the work in size. Where the original essay had set out his theory of the *Judenthum* 'force' bent on destruction of 'true culture,' his January 1869 edition claimed that *Judenthum* had in fact achieved "total victory...on every side." Moreover, he claimed that he himself had been used as a means to achieve that victory. The "implacable hatred...drawn upon [him]...[because he dared to] throw the needful light on this yoke of the ruling Jew-society," he said, was part of a tactical move by international Jewry to deflect attention away from the Jewish question.⁶⁰ By widely defaming his published writings and operas in the press, he argued, Jews had drawn public attention away from questions surrounding their emancipation, enabling them to continue their machinations over the world of ideas, the results of which "crush all free movement and all true human evolution."⁶¹ "The influence that Jews have gained on our mental life," he insisted, "must be owned to as definitive and past dispute." If anything was clear in all of this, Wagner summed, it was that Jews "have made up their minds to live not only *with* us but *in* us."⁶²

A decade later in 1879 Wilhelm Marr, a political activist and journalist influenced by Wagner, Marx, and Bauer, published his own account of Germany's cultural defeat by *Judenthum*.⁶³ *The Victory of Judenthum over Germandom*, however, was published in the wake of

⁶⁰ Ibid., 1869 edition, trans. William Ashton Ellis, *Richard Wagner Prose Works*, Volume 3, 77-122; <http://users.belgacom.net/wagnerlibrary/prose/wagjuda2.htm>. This version includes a two-page dedication and the 1869 supplemental essay. The German original (in Google Books) includes the dedication and the 1850 and 1869 essays, all of which are published under the original title.

⁶¹ Ibid., 4-7, 11-15. "Almost all of the newspapers in Europe are in the hands of Jews" - "the whole army of the Press," "the inner machinery of the press," "the great and influential political daily Press," the "greater German Press," and the "leading journals."

⁶² Ibid., 18-20, italics are his. "Whether the downfall of our culture can be arrested by a violent ejection of the destructive foreign element," he added, "I am unable to decide..."

Jewish emancipation. Yet, rather than lamenting the granting of civil rights to Jews, Marr claimed that their very enactment revealed the fact that emancipation of Jews was never at the core of the Jewish question.⁶⁴ The problem that existed both before and after emancipation, he insisted, was the sociopolitical problem of recognizing and countering the dominating alien force that had been historically unleashed on and in German culture and society. Germans had indeed recognized the problem instinctively, as evidenced by their enmity toward Jews, he argued, but in this they were hardly different than others for “wherever Jews have entered history they have been hated by all peoples without exception.” The need at hand, he urged, was for peoples to awaken to the fact that instinctive hatred of Jews was an unconscious “striving...against the...Jewification of society.”⁶⁵

Marr was fully aware that concern over dominion had informed Christian thinking about Jews since antiquity, and it was on this familiar ground that he shaped his story of the Jewish attempt to encroach, usurp, and hold the reins of western culture through the medium of Judaization. From the onset of his exposition he constructed this story around the striated layers of *Judenthum*'s historical meanings while laboring to assign those meanings to the summarily co-opted term 'Semitic.' Prior to his essay 'Semitic' had been known only in two ways - through the tenth chapter of *Genesis*, where Sem, one of the three sons of Noah, was said to have sired the fathers of twenty six Semite peoples, and through the 1781 classification of those peoples into five Semitic language groups (Syrians, Babylonians, Hebrews, Arabs, and Phoenicians).’ When

⁶³ Wilhelm Marr, *Der Sieg des Judenthums ueber das Germanenthum vom nicht confessionellen Standpunkt aus betrachtet* (1879), (archive.org/details/DerSiegdesJudenthumsueberdasGermanenthum). Partial English translation in Richard Levy, 74-93.

⁶⁴ Barely six months after Wagner's January 1869 edition appeared the Parliament of the North German Confederation had granted equality to Jews and two years later Wilhelm I, the first emperor of a newly unified Germany, had granted the rights of citizens to all Jews in the German Empire.

⁶⁵ Marr, *Victory of Judenthum over Germandom*, (instinctual hatred of Jews) 78-79.

his essay was published a century after the standardized linguistic classification, however, ‘Semitic’ no longer referred to the five related members of a language class nor was it any longer a linguistic classification. “Semitic’ now referred solely to the biologic, religious, and socially related members of the class ‘Jews,’ and, according to Marr’s derivative, *Semitismus* (Semitism) denoted the characteristics, purposes, and aims of that class as a whole.⁶⁶ Yet, while this categorical classification was indeed novel, his conceptual rendering of Semitism was in no way unique, nor was it intended to appear so, for his stated purpose in *Victory of Judenthum over Germandom* was to demonstrate that Semitism had an eighteen hundred year history.⁶⁷

To this end, Marr’s categories of Semitic description - Jewish attributes, the greatest of which is hatred of all non-Jews, Jewish intention to world, western, and German domination, and Judaization as the Jewish *modus operandi* - are precisely the descriptive categories packed into the historical layers of *Judenthum*. Indeed, at the core of Marr’s history of Semitism is *Judenthum*, whose defining characteristic of “tribal consciousness *par excellence*” is said to be perpetually expressed as exclusivity, “legally prescribed enmity” toward others, and a “proclivity to wage a war of cunning against everything non-Jewish.” Other familiar elements appear as well in his portrait of how these hating people, who are said to be hated in return wherever they settle, waged a war for cultural dominance against the peoples of the Western world. Beginning with the “fertile ground” of Christianity, which he calls the representative religion of ‘new Jews,’ and operating as a “state within a state” wherever scattered, Jews are said to have imported Semitism

⁶⁶ Marr was the first to consign ‘Semitic’ solely to Jews but not the first to tamper with the term. Soon after German scholar A.L. Schloelzer rendered the classification in 1781, a discussion ensued about the relationship of language to inherited characteristics; and as early as the 1840s German scholar Christian Lassen argued that “Semites, who spoke a variety of tongues, were egotistical and exclusive, whereas Indo-Europeans, whose languages stemmed from a common origin, were tolerant and altruistic.” See Bernard Williams, *Semites and Antisemites: An Inquiry into Conflict and Prejudice* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 43-57; Mark H. Gelber, "What is Literary Antisemitism?" *Jewish Social Studies*, Volume XLVII, Winter (1985), No.1, 1-20.

⁶⁷ Ibid., for example, V and VI. “1800 Jahre hat der Kampf gegen die juedische Herrschaft,” and “Der 1800 jaehrige Krieg mit dem Judenthum,” 88-90 in Levy translation

into society while simultaneously resisting the Western view of the world.⁶⁸ This Semitic mission of inoculating society with Jewishness, as Marr describes it, eventually allowed Jews to attain world mastery to such an extent that “there is no part of the struggle for existence that fails to pay a commission to *Judenthum*.” By way of Judaized Christianity, business and money markets, monopolies of the press, political and religious reporting, literary criticism, and almost all printed materials, all modern states are said to have fallen to Jewish interests.⁶⁹ The degree to which this was the case in Germany was extreme, Marr said, for the fatherland had gradually become the center of world Semitism, pushing the country “so far into Jewification” that a sudden reversal of its Judaized social structure would cause collapse.⁷⁰

When this conceptual creation of world Semitism as an historical reality based in Germany was debuted in 1879, *The Victory of Judenthum over Germandom* went through twelve editions before the year was out. Both the term and the theory that set Semitism against the peoples of the West - hatred against hatred, force against force, spirit against spirit, in a war for cultural dominance⁷¹ - were hailed as revelatory and quickly validated by groups of varying

⁶⁸ Ibid., (Jewish hatred of others), 78, 82, 91; (non-Jewish hatred of Jews), 78, 79. Among others who had already submitted modernized versions of German reciprocal hatred for Jews was Lutheran theologian and scholar Friedrich Wilhelm Ghillany, who argued in 1844 that “hostility towards the whole of humanity is...the salient feature of Judaism,” and that reciprocal hatred of Jews was “the only possible humanist attitude.” Even though “hatred in general ... [was considered] a non-humane and even anti-humanist phenomenon,” the antihumanist character of Judentum was said to be so pervasive that reciprocal hatred for Jews could be seen as “basically human, for it signifie[d] opposition to the enemies of mankind.” *Das Judentum und die Kritik, oder es bleibt bei den Menschenopfern der Hebraeer und bei der Notwendigkeit einer zeitmuessen Reform des Judentums* (1844); Rotenstreich, 18-19.

⁶⁹ Ibid., (Method of domination, Judaization), 77, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87; (Jewish domination of the West), 78, 80, 82-83, 87-90; (Jewish world domination), 77, 78, 87-89, 90, 92;

⁷⁰ Ibid., (Jewish domination of Germany), 78, 82, 87, 88-89, 92, 93. The possibility also loomed, Marr warned, that Semitism would eventually overtake German law and use it to attain an actual feudal domination over native Germans.

⁷¹ Marr repeatedly speaks of *semitische Volk*, *deutsche Volk*, and a war between *Volksstaemme*, all of which Richard Levy translates into English as “race” in keeping with the scholarly view that Marr was racist. Yet this is somewhat confusing for Marr specifically avoids using *Rasse* when speaking of *Semitismus* or *Judenthum* in order to make two points: that *Judenthum/Semitismus* is a historical culture phenomenon

persuasions. On September 19, for example, barely five months after Semitism's debut, Adolf Stoecker, the Protestant Chaplain of the Berlin Cathedral, warned the Christian Social Workers Party of the "Semitic spirit" that dominated Germans, of the "Jewish spirit" that "de-Germanizes and de-Christianizes," and of the "unbroken Semitism" that set itself against both Christianity and the "German essence."⁷² While Stoecker agreed with Marr that Jews had set "their unbroken Semitism" against the "German essence," he also believed that Germanic-Christian life in combination with legislation could cure Jews of their Semitism. Marr, on the other hand, insisted that "Judaized" Christianity could cure no part of Semitism for it was itself in need of "Semitic" purging.⁷³

(*kulturgeschichtlich Erscheinung*), and that his treatise is not motivated by religious or racial hatred (*Rassenhass*). The only times *Rasse* is used in *Victory*, in fact, is to deny that his argument is racial. This is not to say that Marr was not thinking in racial categories by this time, for Moshe Zimmerman reports that he had already used *Rasse* in his earlier *Der Judenspiegel*, but it is to say that a more literal translation is more conducive to understanding the chronological development of this concept. Moreover, after examining the many extended forms of *Volks* in the extensive 1902 *Muret Sanders* German to English dictionary, it is not clear that 'race' would have been commonly rendered from *Volksstamm* even then. In three and a half long columns of compound nouns and affixes, almost all of the *Volks* words have a national rather than a racial context. *Volksstamm* is one of three forms with a racial meaning, but 'race' is a secondary meaning to 'tribe,' with the more common form for 'race' being *Voelkerrasse*. Further, Marr is not in any way discussing races in *Victory* but, rather, various western peoples and cultures, with emphasis on conflicts between *semitische Volk & juedischen Geist* and *deutsche Volk & germanischen Geist*. In light of this, as well as Marr's point of argument - that Semitism is a historical cultural problem - it seems appropriate to rely on the more literal translation of *Volks* words without imposing racial categories at this point of development.

⁷² Adolf Stoecker, "Unsre Forderungen an das moderne Judentum (Our Demands on Modern Jewry)," September 19, 1879, later published in *Christlich-Sozial: Reden und Aufsätze* (Bielefeld, Leipzig, 1885); English translation, Levy, 58-66. Stoecker had established the Christian Social Workers Party in early 1878 but, according to Richard Levy, this was his first overtly antiJewish speech. It is interesting to note that it is centered around the Semitism concept.

⁷³ When Marr began arguing in his 1876 *Religious Sorties of a Philosophical Tourist* that humanity had taken on the "Jewish essence" through Judaized Christianity, he was arguing in the tradition of Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791), the first German biblical scholar to call for a deJudaization of Christianity, Fichte, who urged in *Characteristics of the Present Age* that Christianity had to be de-Judaized, and Marx, who argued that Christianity was the vehicle through which Jews attained dominion of Western society. After Wagner's much discussed 1850 theory of cultural *Verjudung*, biblical scholar Paul de Lagarde began proclaiming the "spiritual bankruptcy of Christianity" in Germany which was "doomed to extinction" because of its Jewish elements. Jews were said to be a "terrible misfortune for every European people" because they were the "carriers of decay" and polluters of every national culture, and the Jewish problem was said to be that of "Germanism" being destroyed spiritually through the process of *Verjudung*. After

Such representative disagreement, however, did not prevent collaboration in varying degrees between those of both confessional and non-confessional views who sought to solve Germany's *Verjudung* problem. In terms of giving life to Marr's conceptual creation, three collaborative 'firsts' followed in sequence: the first Anti-Semitic League (1879), the first Anti-Semitic Petition (1880-1881), and the first International *Antijuedischen* Congresses (1882 and 1883). As "the first organization anywhere to bear such a title," the League of Anti-Semites is important to our understanding of Semitism as the *antecedent* of antisemitism for it compresses into a few sentences the whole of Wilhelm Marr's treatise and sets forth the term as a dangerous *existing* entity to be countered by those who call themselves Anti-Semites.⁷⁴ From its first use by Marr when the League was established on September 26, 1879, *Antisemitismus* bore a direct relationship to *Verjudung* in the statutes which clearly stated that *Verjudung* was the acting force of *Semitismus*. Indeed, "bring[ing] together non-Jewish Germans of all denominations, all parties, and all walks of life" to "force the Semites back" and save the German fatherland from complete *Verjudung* was the stated purpose of the Anti-Semitic League. Striving together to liberate Germany from alien Jewish domination was also the cry of the first Anti-Semitic Petition in 1880, whose four demands became the framework for all subsequent Anti-Semitic political parties. Using Marr's language of alien conquest to describe the effects of Semitism on non-Jewish society, the Petition was framed around the causal claim that "wherever Christian and Jew enter into social relations," the Jew becomes master and the "native-born Christian population [is moved] in[to] a servile position." The Emancipation influx of the "Semitic element into all

Lagarde, says Steven Ascheim, "it became commonplace to argue that Christians had become weakened and corrupted through Judaization of the church." Moshe Zimmerman, *Wilhelm Marr*, 42-46, 65-69, 71-9; Paul Lawrence Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, 121-122; Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair*, xi-xxx, 40, 61, 93; Ascheim, "The Myth of Judaization," 233; Anders Gerdman, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism*, 39-50.

⁷⁴ Antisemiten-Liga (1879), Statute I, English translation in Peter G.J. Pulzer, *The Rise Of Political Anti-Semitism In Germany And Austria* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964), 51.

positions of power and influence” was said to have endangered the German “national way of life,” forcing the question, “what future is left our fatherland if the Semitic element is allowed to [continue] conquest of our home ground...as it has been allowed to do in the last two decades?”⁷⁵

Semitic conquest was likewise the point of focus at the first International Antijuedischen Congresses in 1882 (Dresden) and 1883 (Chemnitz). Where the League of Anti-Semites and the Anti-Semites Petition focused on the need for immediate counter measures to Semitism in Germany, however, the Congresses poured forth on the immediate need for an international union to fight against the international aims of Semitism. Moreover, where neither Marr’s *Victory of Judenthum over Germandom*, the League, nor the Petition explicitly defined Semites and Semitism according to racial categories, the organizers of the Congresses made clear in its on the *Manifesto* that the topic at hand was the international threat of *der juedischen Race*.⁷⁶ In language that reflects this broader international concern and casts it in racial categories, some three hundred representatives from Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Russia waged a counter plan in September of 1882 against an alleged Jewish *Weltherrschaftsplaene* (plan for world domination).⁷⁷ As the *Manifesto* reveals, this alleged aim of the *semitische Judenrace* was seen as a threat to European Christian states and peoples, and yet the threat itself was not to be viewed solely as a racial or a religious problem. The universal, political, social, and moral-religious character of the *Judenthum* phenomenon, participants said, made it a much more encompassing

⁷⁵ The Anti-Semites Petition (1880-1881) demanded that 1) immigration of alien Jews be prevented or limited; 2) that Jews be excluded from positions of authority and that judiciary employment be limited; 3) that Christian character of primary schools be preserved, with only Christian teachers; 4) that a special census of the Jewish population be reinstituted; Levy 122 -127.

⁷⁶ *Manifest an die Regierungen und Voelker der durch das Judenthum gefaehrden christlichen Staaten, laut Beschlusses des Ersten Internationalen Antijuedischen Kongresses*, Dresden, September 11-12, 1882 (Chemnitz, 1882), original at Brown University.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* The *Manifesto* sets *die juedische race* and *die semitische Judenrace* against the *arische Menschenrace*, *der eropaeisch-arische Race*, *die europaeischen christlichen Voelker*, *der verjudeten europaeischen Staaten*, and *die europaeische christlich Gesellschaft*.

problem, one that threatened the foundations of European culture and civilization, as well as the peace, prosperity, security, and future of European Christian people.⁷⁸

By the second Congress eight months later, the international effort had coalesced under the name of *die Allgemeine Vereinigung zur Bekaempfung des Judenthums* (Association for the Fight Against Judenthum), established a hefty monthly journal under the same name, and gained representatives from Romania, Serbia, and France, as well as interested parties from Slovakia and England.⁷⁹ Self-identified as both an anti-Jewish organization and a rapidly growing anti-Semitic movement, this Congress emphasized the bonding of all nationalities, states, social classes, religious, and non-religious confessions against the “common problem” and “common adversary” of oppressive international Jewry.⁸⁰ The Jewish Question, participants agreed, was the result of the unrelenting Semitic drive toward dominion and oppression, and finding the answer was not only the social concern of each nation but, by virtue of Semitism’s international nature, the social concern of Europe. Because international Jewry was coming together to “undermine the states of Europe,” they reasoned, it was necessary to stand together in a defensive coalition - *antijuedische Internationale gegen Judischen International* - and take up the weapons of science and law to

⁷⁸ Ibid. Fluid interchange at the Congress between the phrases 'europaeische christlich Gesellschaft,' 'europaeischen Staaten,' 'christlichen Voelkern,' and 'europaeisch-arische Race' seems to imply that 'being Christian' is an attribute of the European Aryan race.

⁷⁹ *Schmeitzner's internationale Monatsschrift: Zeitschrift fuer die Allgemeine Vereinigung zur Bekaempfung des Judenthums* served as the journal for the organization. Among those involved in the organization by this time was the German Catholic theologian professor August Rohling from Prague, author of multiple anti-Jewish writings, including the infamous *der Talmudjude*, which can be seen as a sequel to Eisenmenger's *Endecktes Judenthum*, later reprinted as a sourcebook by the Nazi regime.

⁸⁰ Stenographischer Bericht ueber den II. antijuedischen Congress einberufen durch die Allgemeine Vereinigung zur Bekaempfung des Judenthum (Alliance antijuive universelle), *Schmeitzner's internationale Monatsschrift: Zeitschrift fuer die Allgemeine Vereinigung zur Bekaempfung des Judenthums*, 2.Band, 5.Heft (Mai, 1883); microfilm, Berlin.

root out and heap abuse upon all methods by which Jews influenced and prevailed in European society and culture.⁸¹

⁸¹ Ibid., 255-262.

CHAPTER V
THE NAZI SOLUTION:
DOMINION AND DEJUDAIZATION

In his 1870 autobiography Richard Wagner explained his motive behind the 1850 penning of “Das Judenthum in der Musik” as having been compelled to plumb the depths of Jewish influence on German culture through “an epoch making article.”¹ If by epoch making Wagner meant that he wanted his essay to signal a major turning point in the way in which the ‘Jewish question’ was perceived and discussed in Germany, then he indeed accomplished that. While essentially drawing on centuries-old anti-Jewish categories familiar to Germany, he innovatively framed the *Judenthum* arguments of Luther, Eisenmenger, Kant, Fichte, Marx, and others around a theory about the medium used by Jews to infuse German culture with Jewishness. In so doing he not only broadened the manifold ways in which Jews could allegedly Judaize, he set into motion a critical change in the language used to discuss the alleged Judaization of German culture. Throughout winding arguments in both editions of “Das Judenthum” he moved back and forth between the word *Judenthum* and his newly coined word, *Verjudung*, to describe the alleged ‘Jewified’ state of German culture. This 1850 invention of *Verjudung*, which Steven Ascheim says soon “gained wide currency in Germany,”² paved the way for Wilhelm Marr’s 1879 successful co-opting, adaptation, and derivation of *Semitismus* and its contraposition, *Antisemitismus*, which in turn not only gained wide currency in the German language but in

¹ Wagner, *My Life*, VII, 20-21.

²Steven Ascheim, "The Jew Within: The Myth of 'Judaization' in Germany," 221-229. See also Richard Levy, 49-50.

languages throughout the western world. Both *Antisemitismus* and its antecedent creation *Semitismus* bore direct relationship to *Verjudung*, and all were directly related to the manifold layers and layers of negative connotations packed into *Judenthum*. Within two years Eugen Deuhning, a social philosopher at University of Berlin, had added to this coterie of words what some have said was a logical extension: the *Entjudung*, or de-Judaization of German culture, along with *Entjudungsprozeduren* for its implementation.³

With the use of any of these words implying the others, it does not surprise that they began showing up in dictionaries and lexicons as part of one another's meanings. In 1882, for example, when 'Anti-Semite' secured a place in the *Great Brockhaus Lexicon*, it was defined as "an opponent of *Judenthum*, one who fights against the qualities, appearances, and intentions of *Semitismus*."⁴ By the turn of the century "Judaizer" had become one of the common lexical meanings of *Judenthum* in the 1902 *Muret-Sanders* dictionary. While 'Anti-Semitism' was received throughout Europe to describe the ideology behind social, political, and some religious organizations that rose to deal with the alleged threat of *Judenthum*, not all who were opposed to *Judenthum* hailed the term as a suitable descriptor of the contraposition. Both 'Semitism' and 'Anti-Semitism' were refuted by a small minority but only in the sense that the terms lacked the precision of *Judenthum*. It was neither the theory nor the conceptual matter behind the terms being refuted, in other words, but only the denotations of the alleged culture-destroying phenomenon and the self-protecting movement against it.

³ Eugen Duehring, *Die Judenfrage als Rassen und Kulture Frage* (The Jewish Question as the Race and Culture Question), 1881. Duehring warns of the *Verjudung* of nations in which Jews live, with emphasis on the "challenge" of *Entjudung*. Mark H. Gelber, "What is Literary Anti-Semitism?" *Jewish Social Studies*, Volume XLVII, Winter 1985, 14-15; Uriel Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870-1914*, trans. Noah Jacobs, (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1975), 264-266.

⁴ Zimmerman, 113.

Of those who voiced the objection that it was Jews, not the whole range of Semitic peoples, who perpetrated war for cultural dominance, Duehring was prominent, arguing in 1881 that the usage of any terms other than *Judenthum*, *Jude*, and their cognates to denote the Jewish 'essence' would fail to address the Jewish Problem. Debate over Duehring's thesis was part of the Second International Antijuedischen Congress in Chemnitz (1883), in fact, and, after Theodor Fritsch founded the *Anti-Semitische Correspondenz* in 1885, the issue was debated in its pages. In 1889 some level of definitional agreement was reached in Fritsch's 1889 *Anti-Semitic Catechism*, a guidebook published annually since 1887, wherein Semitism was said to mean "the essence of the Jewish race" and Anti was said to mean "against," such that the logical meaning of "Anti-Semitism is therefore the struggle against Semitism." "Since almost the entire Semitic race in Europe is Jewish," the *Catechism* went on, "we therefore understand...[that] an Anti-Semite is a Jew hater, one opposed to the Jews."⁵

Agreement on the appropriateness of the term to describe the Jewish essence was short lived, however, for a decade later in 1907, amidst complaints that the term *Antisemitismus* was "unfortunate," *Anti-Semitic Catechism* was renamed *Handbuch der Judenfrage*. Adolf Hitler was living in Vienna (ca.1908-1913) when he first became acquainted with Fritsch's *Handbuch*, which he later credited with "preparing the ground for the Nationalist Socialist Movement."⁶ He apparently found nothing wrong with its defining of Semitism as "the essence of the Jewish race," for he speaks without derision of the need for an "anti-Semitism based on reason" in his first known writing on the topic in 1919. He is also quoted by Dietrich Eckart in the fall of 1923 as

⁵ Theodore Fritsch, *Antisemitic Catechism*, in Moshe Zimmerman, *Wilhelm Marr, The Patriarch of Anti-Semitism*, 113.

⁶ Matthias Brosch and Richard S. Levy, "Handbook of the Jewish Question," Volume 1, *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution*, edited by Richard S. Levy (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO Inc, 2005), 289-291.

referring to National Socialists as “we anti-Semites,” and in his 1924-1925 *Mein Kampf*, he does not fault terms when he speaks of becoming an anti-Semite in Vienna, of the need for a systematic anti-Semitism in 1918, and of such a system taking root in 1919 after he arrived in Munich.⁷ By 1930, however, Hans H.F. Guenther, a leading Nazi racial theorist, was arguing again that the term ‘anti-Semitism’ was badly chosen and should be replaced by ‘anti-Jewishness.’⁸ Fritsch in turn posed *Judengegner* and *Anti-Rabbinismus* as possible alternatives in his 1931 *Handbuch*, but when the 1933 edition appeared after Hitler’s rise to power *Anti-Rabbinismus* had been removed, anti-Semitism was again lamented as unsuitable, and the term *Judengegner* (adversary of the Jews) was hailed as preferable.

This, says Moshe Zimmerman, became the “guiding line” for all editions of the *Handbook* between 1933 and 1939, and it was undoubtedly enhanced by Hitler’s endorsement of the manual on the cover of the 1934 edition.⁹ Goebbels’ Ministry of Propaganda chimed in a year later on August 22, just twenty-three days before the 1935 Nuremberg Laws began to define Jews according to degrees of Jewishness. Both *antisemitisch* and *Anti-Semitismus* were to be avoided when discussing the Jewish Question, Goebbels directed, because German politics were directed against only Jews and not all Semites.¹⁰ The issue was reinforced again in June 1939 when

⁷ Adolf Hitler, Letter to Adolf Gemlich, September 16, 1919, *Saemliche Auszeichnungen, 1905-1924*, Eberhard Jaeckel, editor (Stuttgart, 1980), 88-90; translated by Richard S. Levy at www.h-net.org. Dietrich Eckart, *Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin: A Dialogue Between Adolf Hitler & Me* (Munich, March 1924). Originally published as NSDAP pamphlet, later in *National Socialist World*, Vol.2 (Fall 1966), translated by William L. Pierce, 13-33. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Volume 1 (Munich, Fall 1925), Volume 2 (Munich, December 1926), translated by Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), 64, 560-561.

⁸ Hans H.F. Guenther, *Rassenkunde des Jüdischen Volkes* (Munich, 1930), 315; cited by Zimmerman.

⁹ Brosch and Levy, “Handbook of the Jewish Question,” *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution*, 289-291.

¹⁰ Zimmerman’s citation allowed me to locate the August 22, 1935 order “Anweisungen der Pressekonferenz der Regierung des Dritten Reiches:” “Das Propagandaministerium bittet, in der Judenfrage das Wort antisemitisch oder Antisemitismus zu vermeiden, weil die deutsche Politik sich nur gegen die

directives were issued to German editors, instructing that *Judengegnerschaft* properly expressed the adversarial attitude of the Reich. After the onset of war in September, the 1939 edition of *Handbuch der Jjudenfrage* included the explanation that ‘Anti-Semitism’ was unsuitable “if only [because] there are other peoples with Semitic languages who stand in complete opposition to the Jews.”¹¹ It was reinforced again in September 1942 and September 1944 when the Propaganda Ministry *Periodical Service* instructed editors to “strengthen and deepen existing sympathies in the Islamic world” by replacing the words ‘Semitism’ and ‘anti-Semitism’ with phrases depicting “‘opposition to Jews,’ ‘hostility toward Jews,’ or ‘anti-Judaism.’”¹² In between these *Periodical Service* directives, the 1943 *Handbuch der Judenfrage* renamed its German history of antisemitism, laying it to rest for the remainder of the war under the title ‘*Antijudaismus*,’ a category of text that followed a long and ranging history of *Judenthum* and its *Verjudung* of economic, political, intellectual, moral, cultural, and religious realms of German life.¹³

In contrast to this slaying and resurrection of names for the alleged Jewish problem and its contraposition ideology is the consensus about that which was being named. There was no debate at all on the alleged Jewish threat, for National Socialist claims against Jews were historically constructed around that familiar and unquestioned chain of reference predominate in Germany since the Reformation - *Judenthum*, *Verjudung*, *Semitismus*. As historian Louis

Juden, nicht aber gegen die Semiten schlechthin richtet. Es soll stattdessen das Wort antijuedisch gebraucht werden. Cited in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe Historisches lexikon zur politisch-sozialen in Deutschland*, BD.1 (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1972), „Antisemitismus im Nationalsozialismus,” by Thomas Nipperday and Reinhard Ruerup, 129-153.

¹¹ “Antisemitismus,” *Zeitschriften-Dienst* 6, no.22 (June 13, 1939), in Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), 76; Zimmerman, 112-115.

¹² „Die islamische Welt als Kulturfaktor,” *Zeitschriften-Dienst* 175/44, no.7514 (September 11, 1942), and *Vertrauliche Informationen des Reichsministeriums fuer Volksmeinung und Propaganda* VI, 214/44 (September 30, 1944), Herf, 76, 160.

¹³ Theodor Fritsch, *Handbuch der Judenfrage* (Leipzig, 1944), www.archive.org/details/Handbuch_Der_Judenfrage.

Newman reported in 1925, the Judaizing word and concept was part of the language and literature of every Christian people,¹⁴ and it was from that civilization-wide permeation that all forms of modern antisemitism, whether racial or not, brokered its common understanding about the Judaizing and dominating intentions of Jews. It was in face precisely on the grounds of that alleged continuity of *Judenthum*'s historical threat to Christianity, peoples, and nations that modern antisemitism argued its claims. The fact that the distinguishing features of the alleged Jewish threat had rested under the intension of *Judenthum* long before they were transformed into racial characteristics circumscribed by the name *Semitismus* was not viewed as a co-opting problem but was prominently touted as evidence of the problem's historicity.

Beyond time, place, and circumstance, the only significant difference between the Nazi Judaizing claims of the twentieth century (which ran concurrent with Judaizing claims of antisemitic ideologues throughout Europe) and the Christian Judaizing claims of antiquity and the Middle Ages (on which all such future claims were dependent) is that the alleged Judaizing force of Jews had become part and parcel of Nazi racial theory. The Jewish problem could no longer be 'fixed' by baptism, emancipation, or assimilation as non-racial theologians had claimed, but only by the dual expunging of Jewish blood from German biology, and Jewish influence, Jewish thinking, and all identifiable traces of Jewishness from German culture and society.

That the National Socialist regime did not begin expurgation in that order after coming to power in 1933 has duly exercised historical explanations of the centrality of racial purity in Nazi antisemitism. As Karl Schleunes points out in his 1970 seminal study of Nazi antiJewish legislation between 1933 and 1939, instead of launching "a frontal attack on the blood aspects of assimilation" the earliest Nazi laws defined Jews as 'non-Aryan' and then began purging them from the professional civil service. Yet Schleunes cogently explains that reversal in expected

¹⁴ Louis Israel Newman, *Judaizing Influence on Christian Reform Movements*, 2.

order in *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz* while advancing the commonly held scholarly belief that racial purity was central to the Nazi Jewish problem.¹⁵ In a completely different type of study focusing on Nazi war propaganda between 1939 and 1945, however, Jeffrey Herf has argued in *The Jewish Enemy* that it was not the centrality of racial purity that pushed Nazism “from discrimination to mass extermination” but the radical Nazi ideology of Jewish intention and aggression toward world domination.¹⁶ Analyses stemming from my own study suggests that *both* centrality positions are the case in that it is logically possible that both racial purity and domination ideology were central to Nazi antisemitism.

While ‘central’ is generally used in scholarship to denote ‘that thing around which everything else pivots,’ it is not the case that ‘being central’ necessitates ‘being sole or exclusive.’ A thing can be central to something else and not be limited to a single part, as, indeed, any ideology is a body of ideas consisting of many parts. Within that body of ideas, however, are both essential and non-essential ideas, meaning those ideas without which a belief system would not be the same belief system (essential),¹⁷ and those that do not affect the integrity of the belief system whether present or missing (non-essential). In the critical sense of being essential or

¹⁵ Karl A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1939* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990, 1970), 101-102, 120, 129, 133. Schleunes explains this reversal in expected order in two ways. First, as the elimination of undesirable elements “infiltrat[ing] civil service during the Weimar period;” and, second, as a complex result of inadequate terminology, definitions, agreement, and understanding of how to translate Nazi ideology into concrete legal tenets, one that both foundered and drove Nazi policies on Jews through complicated developmental stages between 1933 and 1939. While his findings demonstrate that the underlying complexities of antiJewish attitudes influenced the development of policies as often as did the attitudes between 1933 and 1938, he is not saying that Nazi attitudes were not the central motivating force of Nazi antiJewish policies. The complexities of defining and legislating antiJewish beliefs were, on his analysis, discovered piecemeal, and only as they were recognized were they resolved haltingly by trial and error through the hierarchal maze of inter-organizational competing agendas.

¹⁶ Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), 37.

¹⁷ The crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, as a familiar example, are thus essential or necessary to Christianity, while the doctrines of confession and celibacy are not.

necessary, it is thus possible to say that two (or more) different ideas can be central to Nazi antisemitism without any logical confusion. Yet would such a claim be valid in the case of racial purity and domination ideology? While defilement of German blood was indeed “original sin” to Hitler,¹⁸ it was not the only threat attributed to Jews nor was it the primary way in which Jews were said to have wrecked havoc on Germany. Some German blood had indeed been ‘infected’ by Jews, but it was German culture, the German mind, and the German spirit that was said to be most ‘infected,’ and this had allegedly occurred as a result of the Judaizing aspect of the Jewish drive toward world domination. The following analysis provides a fundamental view of the relation between these two principal Jewish threats, which, together, were the central diptych of Nazi antisemitism.

The idea of racial purity that emerges from Hitler’s first known writing on antisemitism (1919), Dietrich Eckhart’s *Dialogue Between Adolf Hitler & Me* (1924), and volumes one and two of *Mein Kampf* (1925 and 1926, respectively) rests on Hitler’s notion of intrinsic ‘racial foundations,’ each of which is race-specific and contained in the bloodlines of all members of each respective race.¹⁹ The racial foundation bestowed upon each race determines not only the intrinsic moral, spiritual, and physical characteristics of its members, it also determines the cultural configuration of the group as a whole.²⁰ The degree to which each race preserves its foundation determines its level of purity,²¹ and its level of purity determines its moral, spiritual, intellectual, and physical strengths in the natural world of struggle between weak and strong - and that, coupled with continual generational commitment to safeguard the principles undergirding

¹⁸ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 249.

¹⁹ Previously cited ff. 8, 9, 10.

²⁰ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 134, 249, 284-296, 338-339.

²¹ Ibid., for the duty of individuals and state to safeguard the racial foundation, 214, 254-55, 383, 291.

the foundation, determines the outcome of the race. As viewed in the continuum in Figure 5 below, that outcome could theoretically result in either the preservation of the racial foundation, the end of the race altogether, or any of a number of stages in-between that weakens the foundation and makes the race vulnerable to its racial enemies.

Figure 5: The Racial Foundation Continuum in *Mein Kampf*

Racial Mixing<	>Racial Purity
Racial Degradation	Preservation of Racial Characteristics
Weakening of Superior Attributes (<i>moral, spiritual, intellectual, physical</i>)	Strengthening of Superior Attributes (<i>moral, spiritual, intellectual, physical</i>)
Weakened Resistance to Enemies	Strengthened Resistance to Enemies
Eventual End of Race	Preservation of Race

The more the racial foundation remains intact, in other words, the greater the chance of racial survival. Yet preservation of the foundation is not only necessarily related to racial survival it is necessarily related to the numerous warring successes and defeats that ultimately determine survival. In the case of Germany's defeat in 1918 - Hitler's long and winding example in *Mein Kampf* - the degree to which the German Aryan racial foundation was corrupted was not sufficient to determine extinction in 1914, but it was sufficiently corrupt to account for the degeneration of moral, spiritual, intellectual, and physical attributes necessary to withstand Germany's enemies. The defeat of WWI, like all events of world history, was thus reducible to racial causes.

In making this and other similar claims about the consequences of not preserving the racial foundation, however, Hitler was not saying that it was only the blood purity of the racial foundation that had been affected nor was he saying that defeat on the August 1918 battlefields had caused the fall of Germany. The fall of Germany, Hitler contended, was the end result of the systematic robbing of inherent Aryan attributes prior to WWI by the "mightiest counterpart to the

Aryan,” the attack having been effectuated over time by the weakening of racial purity and the weakening of the Aryan culture that stood guard over its racial foundation. Jew always used “every means...to destroy the racial foundations of the people he set out to subjugate,” Hitler argued, in this case by attacking both from within the bloodline as well as from *without* through a slowly corroding ‘Jewification’ of the Aryan culture.²² Jews had not only biologically defiled Aryan blood, they had attacked Germanic racial purity by “pulling down the blood barriers for others ...and bring[ing] the Negroes into the Rhineland.” In order to lower Aryan resistance, they had also proffered relentless attacks on the ideals and principles that stood guard on Aryan racial purity by acting as purveyors of prostitution, human trafficking, and other obvious vices, while at the same time propagating sham ‘noble’ ideals such as “the equality of all men without regard for race and color.”²³ This latter and more subtle attack was part of the alleged systematic activity that affected blood purity in particular, but it was also part of a general assault on the Aryan cultural foundation, which, in the mind of National Socialism, was inseparable from racial foundation.

Any attack on Aryan culture, in other words, was an attack on the racial foundation, and any attack on the racial foundation, whether aimed specifically at biologically diluting Aryan blood purity or not, was an attack on the Aryan race. Moreover, because Aryan culture was believed to bear the distinction of being the beneficent source of higher humanity for all races, any attack on the Aryan racial foundation was viewed as attack on the advancement of mankind in general. Hitler’s division of races into three categories of culture-founders, culture-bearers, and culture-destroyers helps us to understand how this is so. Within his division of cultural founders, bearers, and destroyers, only Aryans and Jews bear the distinction of ‘being sole:’ the former as

²² Ibid, 231, 327-329, 338-339.

²³ Ibid., 57-59, 247, 316, 624.

the sole founders of true human culture and the latter as the sole destroyers of culture. Each possessed inherent attributes that stemmed from the instinct of self-preservation and compelled them toward domination in the hierarchy of races. Since all attributes are manifested race-specifically, however, the resulting domination of could be just and beneficial or unjust and harmful. In the Aryan race, self-preserving instincts that compel toward domination of others manifests in benevolent acts that subordinate personal interests in favor of creating and building enduring culture. As “founder of all higher humanity” and standard-bearers for all “human cultural development,” Aryans are thus compelled by beneficent purpose to dominate in order to lead the weaker to higher development.²⁴ In the Jewish race, however, self-preserving instincts manifest as the “fully developed” instinct of egoistic preservation, one that is bereft of any sort of “culture-creating force” because it extends no further than immediate Jewish gain.²⁵ “What sham culture the Jew possesses is the property of other peoples,” Hitler argued, acquired and for the most part destroyed when he parasitically plants himself in the midst of other peoples.²⁶

In the case of Germany, the culture-destroying work began when the first Germanic state was formed, a point in time, Hitler said, that “may be viewed as the beginning of a new and lasting Jewification of Central and Northern Europe.”²⁷ The Judaization was said to have been

²⁴ Ibid., 285-289, 290-292 (“Aryan[s]...subject foreign peoples and then...develop [their dormant] capacities”), 294-295 (justifies subjugating lower peoples to achieve “progress of humanity”), 296-300.

²⁵ Ibid., 289, 296-299. Hitler says the German word *Pflichterfuellung* (fulfillment of duty to serve community) designates this kind of Aryan activity;” 298. With no creative force, no geographical territory, no “correct interpretation of ‘work,’” and no self-sacrifice, ‘true’ culture was said to be absent among Jews.

²⁶ The parasite metaphor is rife in *Mein Kampf*, i.e. 300-303, 304-305 (the Jew is “only and always a parasite in the body of other peoples”), 310 (“a true blood sucker”), 313. Hitler made the same argument in 1919 with a different metaphor: “in his effects and consequences, [the Jew] is like a racial tuberculosis of the nations.”

²⁷ Ibid., 300, 308. Hitler seems to be referring to the last half of the 9th century after the death of Charlemagne when the Holy Roman Empire divided into eastern and western kingdoms that evolved respectively into France and Germany.

slow and systematic, and the pattern was “always the same or similar wherever Jews encountered Aryan peoples.” The Jew operated as a “hidden force,” orchestrating global events to the degree that “*all* social injustices of any significance in the world today can be traced back to [their] subterranean influence.”²⁸ As a people who “sneak their way into the rest of mankind like drones,”²⁹ they used behind-the-scenes agitation to propagate religious, societal, and political struggles that diverted public attention away from their ultimate goal,³⁰ while at the same time employing deception and subterfuge to infect the strife-ridden societies with ideological ideas that wore away Aryan principles while advancing their own.³¹ Indeed, according to *Mein Kampf*, it was Jewish ideas themselves that served as frontline offense while Jews pursued their struggle for world conquest throughout Europe. And it was to those ideas that Hitler referred when he said that the Aryan racial foundation had been sufficiently attacked and ‘robbed’ to cause the fall of Germany in 1918.³²

Military collapse was itself ...the first consequence ...of an ethical and moral poisoning, of a diminution in the instinct of self-preservation...which for many years had begun to undermine the foundations of the people and the Reich. The defeats on the battlefield on August 1918...[did] not...cause our downfall...it was brought about by that power which prepared these defeats over many decades, systematically robbing our people of the political and moral instincts and forces which alone make nations capable and worthy of existence.

The “ultimate and most decisive” cause of the German collapse, according to Hitler, was “the failure to recognize the racial problem and especially the Jewish menace,” to which he

²⁸ Eckart, *Dialogue with Adolf Hitler*, 14, 17, 21, 28, 31, 33; Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 150, italics his; see 308-327 for the alleged historical pattern of Jewification in Europe.

²⁹ Ibid., Hitler, 150, italics his.

³⁰ Ibid., 560-573.

³¹ In Eckhart’s *Dialogue*, Hitler explains the corrosive effects of Jewish ideas as a “war[ring] down [of] all the rest of mankind,”³³.

³² Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 231, 327-329.

referred earlier in *Mein Kampf* as the “Jewification of our spiritual life...[which would] sooner or later destroy our entire offspring.”³³ In making such claims, however, he was not saying that the threat of biological defilement was secondary to the Judaization of Aryan racial principles but that it was not primary in the sense of being the *sole* aspect of racial purity. Loss of blood purity *began* with the corrosion of racial principles that stood guard over it, yet blood purity was not exclusively dependent upon those principles in the sense of a linear causation. The slowly corroding Jewification that had allegedly worn down the tenets of Aryan racial purity had also worn down the principles of the Aryan racial foundation on which Aryan culture was established, and vice versa, for each was believed to be mutually affected by the other.

As portrayed here, the imminent danger of Jewish ideas to the German racial foundation appears to lay more in the threat of Jewish ideas than in the threat of German-Aryan blood being defiled en masse by Jews. In terms of numbers, for example, Hitler cites in *Mein Kampf* some “hundreds of thousands of our people” who were said to be blindly ignoring the German-Aryan racial barriers,³⁴ while Jewish ideas that weakened the German Aryan racial foundation - equality, democracy, internationalism, cosmopolitanism, social justice, pacifism, and so on - already held sway over millions in and throughout Europe.³⁵ It was in fact a Jewish idea rather than the overrun of racial boundaries that Hitler prophesied would bring about the global doom of man. “If

³³Ibid., 327 and 247. Hitler ties ‘Jewification’ to blood purity here by explicitly attributing to Jews the mammonization of “our mating instinct.”

³⁴ Ibid., 562.

³⁵ In his earliest writing on antisemitism in 1919, without a mention of the Jewish threat to racial purity, Hitler warned of the “systematic and pernicious effect of the Jews as a totality” while speaking of that effect “as a racial tuberculosis of the nations.” There is likewise no mention of Jews breaching racial lines in Dietrich Eckhart’s 1924 *Dialogue*, where Hitler depicts Jews as “the hidden force” behind historical events, claiming that “All social injustices of any significance in the world today can be traced back to the subterranean influence of the Jews.” Moreover, it was only after emancipation that Jews “openly breech[ed] racial barriers by defiling German girls and pawning their women off on Christian men,” while the “lasting Jewification of Central and Northern Europe” had allegedly been going on centuries, wearing away more and more Aryan principles. See *Mein Kampf*, 315-316, 308; Eckhart’s *Dialogue*, 33.

with the help of his Marxist creed” he claimed, the Jew is victorious over the other peoples of the world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of humanity.”Yet it was not Marxism per se that was the imminent threat, or Bolshevism as he called it elsewhere, but “only as a preliminary to the further extension of the Jewish tendency of world conquest.”³⁶ “Bolshevization,” in other words, was but the twentieth century version of the historical Judaizing method by which Jews gained control of societies in an elaborate stratagem to effectuate world domination.

Again, in making these claims, Hitler is not saying that racial purity was less central to Nazi antisemitism than concern about Judaization, but, rather, that concern about Judaization *is* concern about racial purity. Indeed, given the emphasis placed on the Judaization of racial foundations as perpetual acts of war in a historical sweep toward Jewish world conquest, he may well be saying that one cannot speak about the weakening or strengthening of racial purity without addressing the threat of Judaization. That this is the case is certainly implied when Hitler says, “anyone who wants to free the German blood from the manifestations and vices of today, which were originally alien to its nature, will first have to redeem it from the foreign virus of these manifestations.” Clearly, he is not speaking literally of blood but of acquired “manifestations and vices” not inherent to Aryan nature, and he does so immediately after speaking of the “divided state of nature” caused by such changes in the racial foundation. Having just spent a hundred pages elucidating the claim that it is “always” the alien Jew who undermines the German people by planting “dangerous modes of thought,” one can assume that Jewish ideas remain under attack here. Such becomes evident when he assigns equivalence between the racial problem and the Jewish problem, which he had already outlined in his previous chapter as the subterranean Jewification of the West.³⁷ “Without the clearest knowledge” of that equivalence,

³⁶ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 65. It is within this context that Hitler makes the oft-quoted statement “*by defending myself against the Jews, I am fighting for the work of the Lord* (italics his).” See also 623-624, 661-662.

without the clearest understanding of how such ongoing Judaization eroded the racial foundation, he insisted, “there [would] never be a resurrection of the German nation.”³⁸ The tightening of racial boundaries was a necessary given, as was the “assembling and preserving of the most valuable stocks of basic racial elements,” but, as Hitler makes abundantly clear, the restoration of the Aryan racial foundation also required removal of everything Jewish from Aryan thinking.³⁹

If we are to take Hitler at his word here, then both the April 1933 laws and the 1935 laws promulgated at Nuremberg can be seen as legal addresses to the mutually dependent threats of racial purity and the “conscious purpose” that was allegedly destroying the German racial foundation.⁴⁰ Although the 1933 laws did not address the purity of the racial foundation directly, the defining of Jews as non-Aryans did so indirectly by initiating Jewish purging from the most influential spheres of German life, thereby reducing opportunities for furthering Judaization.⁴¹ When Nazi legislation at last made a frontal attack on the problem of racial purity on September 15, 1935, Hitler’s speech prior to the promulgation of those laws said nothing about German blood, race, or racial purity,⁴² but his prefatory comments did center around the “almost exclusively Jewish elements” instigating a “campaign to spread animosity and confusion among

³⁷ Ibid., 136, 138, 287; also 150, 153, 231, 232, 247, 313-318, 351, 564, 623.

³⁸ Ibid., 300-329; 338-339. Hitler again points to the damaging effect to all human culture when the Aryan ‘culture-bearing’ racial foundation is eroded.

³⁹ Ibid., 398.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 669. See also 325 and 565 (“the Jew destroys the racial foundations of our existence and thus destroys our people for all time”).

⁴¹ This is not to diminish the point that the laws removed Jews from the German economy. For details surrounding the 1933 laws see Schleunes, *Twisted Road*, especially 92-114.

⁴² Hitler, Speech to Reichstag, September 15, 1933. The campaign to which he referred was multi-faceted, involving the “Bolshevist International of Moscow,” the “Bolshevist revolutionary agitation in Germany,” Jewish “insult to the German flag,” and a rising “opinion among Jews in German that the time ha[d] come to set Jewish interests in clear opposition to the German national interests in the Reich.” His legislative solution was to bring “a framework within which the German Volk would be in a position to establish tolerable relations with the Jewish people;”

the peoples.” With the first Supplementary Decrees on November 14, as Karl Schleunes has critically observed, Jews began to be defined according to one’s forebear’s relation to Judaism, as an indicator of one’s degree of Jewishness.⁴³ This second definitional method not only determined degree of fitness/unfitness for Aryan marriage, it simultaneously diminished possibilities for Jews to exert influence by systematically disenfranchising them over time of rights and means to exist. Moreover, both legalized distinctions of Jews in a society already permeated with threatening connotations of *Judenthum*, *Verjudung*, and *Semitismus* had their own sets of catalytic effects, as illustrated by the following case study on reception of the 1933 and 1935 laws.

Within a month of the promulgation of the 1933 Reich Citizenship Law, Philip Lenard, 1905 Nobel Laureate in Physics and old line racial theorist versed in the threat of Judaized culture,⁴⁴ is found publicly extolling the coming of Hitler and his ‘nightmare-disintegrating’ legislation that was reversing “the massive introduction of Jews into influential positions at universities and academies.” As understood by Lenard and his science cohort, the “damaging influence by Jews” was being exposed, and “the alien spirit that wreaked such havoc on the solid foundations of science...[was now] leaving the universities.”⁴⁵ While the 1933 laws were praised

⁴³ Schleunes, *Legislating the Holocaust: The Bernard Loesener Memoirs and Supporting Documents* (Boulder: Westview Press, Perseus Books Group, 2001), 21, for the three laws promulgated at the close of the Nuremberg Party Rally on September 15 and their subsequent Ordinances; see also 154.

⁴⁴ More than a year before *Mein Kampf* was published, Lenard had co-authored an essay with Johannes Stark, 1919 Nobel Laureate in Physics, depicting Hitler as the ‘culture-bearing’ genius who had come to rescue Germany from the “racially alien spirit that ha[d] been busily at work for over 2,000 years.” Philipp Lenard and Johannes Stark, „Hitlergeist und Wissenschaft,“ *Grossdeutsche Zeitung, Tageszeitung fuer nationale und soziale Politik und Wirtschaft*, May 8, 1924, Vol.1, No.81,1-2, reprinted in *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, Vol.7, No.71, February 1936. Klaus Hentschel, editor, *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, trans. Ann M. Hentschel (Basel. Boston. Berlin: Birkhaeuser Verlag, 1996), Hentschel, 110-111.

⁴⁵ Philipp Lenard, ”Ein grosser Tag fuer die Naturforschung,“ *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 13, 1933, 133rd Edition, second supplement, (Northern Germany), Vol.46, in Hentschel, 40-52, 73ff. The same understanding appears on the student level as well. As part of the effort to assist implementation of the

as great achievement in diminishing Jewish influence, however, the actual work of rescuing the disciplinary realms of knowledge from Jewish ideas fell to specialists within each field. Thus, Lenard is found in August 1935, a month before the Nuremberg Laws were issued, penning the “Foreword” to his *Deutsche Physik*, in which he sets out the “conflict” between Aryan and Jewish science, the latter depicted as having “installed itself securely in public education” as the dominating influence.⁴⁶ His intention in issuing this four-volume academic tome was to chart a path of return to the Germanic-Aryan principle of “quest[ing] for truth.” To struggle in this way against the Jewishness that was falsifying science was, in his view and that of his cohort, to participate in Germany’s “attempt to rescue the Aryan spirit on earth” and to “cultivat[e] the best that mankind has to offer.”

At the Heidelberg inauguration of the Philipp Lenard Institute four months later in December, Johannes Stark, 1919 Nobel Laureate in Physics and newly appointed President of the Reich Physical and Technical Institute, promoted Lenard’s struggle against “the overpowering influence of Jewry” as one to be imitated by all German scientists.⁴⁷ Coming as it did on the heels of the Nuremberg defining of Jews according to degrees of Jewishness, Stark’s urging to emulate Lenard’s struggle unleashed a vitriolic and protracted campaign to eliminate all things ‘Jewish’ in physics. The following month *Voelkischer Beobachter* featured an essay denigrating ‘Jewish

Aryan paragraph, the German Student League, the majority student voice at most universities by 1931, posted “Twelve Theses Against the UnGerman Spirit” at University of Berlin on April 13, charging Jews with being “our most dangerous adversary” and urging students to “root out Jewish lies and stigmatize treachery.” Other theses claimed that “Jews are aliens” and that “the Jew can only think like a Jew” as part of the argument for student associations to provide lists of university teachers who were or should be affected by the Aryan paragraph, and to urge boycotts of those who were not yet suspended. Hentschel, 40-42, 55(ff6).

⁴⁶ Lenard, “Foreword (August 1935),” *Deutsche Physik in vier Bänden, Erster Band* (Munich: J.F. Lehmann, 1936), Hentschel, 101-109. Lenard argued that ‘international science’ was a but a ruse for Jewish ideas, and that theoretical Jewish physics equated truth with untruth and falsified reality.

⁴⁷ Johannes Stark, “Philipp Lenard als deutscher Naturforscher, Rede zur Einweihung Philipp-Lenard-Instituts in Heidelberg am 13. Dezember 1935,” *nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, Vol.7, No.71 (February 1936), 106-112; Hentschel, 109-116.

physics' as an assault on truth while praising Lenard as the scientist who first recognized that 'German' should be held above 'Jewish.'⁴⁸ Werner Heisenberg, 1932 Nobel Laureate in Physics, refuted almost immediately, but his essay was held by the editor until it was reviewed by Stark. When the February 28 refutation appeared calling the provoking essay "erroneous and misleading," while defending the significance of Einstein's relativity theory, it was juxtaposed with Stark's review, castigating Heisenberg's defense of "Jewish theory" and singling him out as a prime example of an Aryan scientist seduced by 'Jewishness.'⁴⁹

The ratchet was especially primed the following year (1937) by two essays in the widely circulated SS journal, *Das Schwarze Korps*. The first, entitled "White Jews in Science," warned against a "primitive type of anti-Semitism that limit[ed] itself to Jews alone," arguing that a Jew-free Germany will not resolve the Jewish problem because "the *Verjudung* of our public life" was also propagated by Judaized Germans, making "any victory of racist anti-Semitism" only a "partial victory." The essay went on to denigrate Heisenberg and other Aryan scientists who defended 'Jewish theories' as "White Jews" (*Weisse Juden*), the sub-categories of which were *Gesinnungsjuden* (Jews by mentality), *Geistesjuden* (Jews in spirit), and *Charakterjuden* (Jew types), and "puppets of *Judenthum*...[who] must disappear just as the Jews themselves."⁵⁰ The unequivocal message - "we should not content ourselves with insisting only on a thorough

⁴⁸ Willi Menzel, "Deutsche Physik und Juedische Physik," *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Vol.49, No.29, January 19, 1936, Northern Edition A, 7; Hentschel, 119-121. Menzel was a PhD candidate at the Berlin Polytechnic Institute and leader of the professional branch of the Nazi student organization.

⁴⁹ Werner Heisenberg, "Zum Artikel: Deutsche und juedische Physik, Entgegnung von Prof.Dr. Heisenberg," *Voelkischer Beobachter*, February 28, 1936, Northern Edition, No.59, 6; Hentschel, 121-124. Johannes Stark, "Zum Artikel: Deutsche und juedische Physik, Stellungnahme von Prof.Dr.J.Stark," *Voelkischer Beobachter*, February 28, 1936, Northern Edition, No.59, 6; Hentschel, 124-127. Over the next two years, Heisenberg was openly denigrated as a traitor, interrogated by the Gestapo on numerous occasions, spied on at lectures, monitored by way of microphones, and thoroughly scrutinized by Himmler himself before being exonerated in July of 1938. See Heinrich Himmler, Letter to Ludwig Prandtl (July 21, 1938) and Letter to Werner Heisenberg (July 21, 1938, Hentschel, 176-178.

⁵⁰ "Weisse Juden in der Wissenschaft," *Das Schwarze Korpse*, no.28, July 15, 1937; Hentschel, 152-157.

implementation of the Nuremberg laws...we must also exterminate the Jewish spirit”- was continued in the second essay by Johannes Stark, who employed the same terms and added new ones.⁵¹ Calling for purging of the “politically bankrupt science” that kept “the Jewish spirit alive at German universities,” Stark used both *Judengenossen* (Aryan supporters of Jews) and *Judenzoeglinge* (Aryan students of Jews) to point to Aryan scientists who still retained teaching positions even though they had “previously supported Jewish power in German science.” While it was true that Jewish influence “on the German press, literature, and art, as well as in the legal system, ha[d] been eliminated,” Stark warned, “the Jewish spirit continues on unweakened...seek[ing] to dominate by securing and consolidating its tactical influence.”

As the furor droned on, the history of Jewish physics was linked to *Kristallnacht* in an extensive essay written by applied physicist Ludwig Glaser and published in the November 1939 issue of *Advances in the Natural Sciences*, just weeks after Germany invaded Poland.⁵² In what might be called a genealogy of the ‘fathers of Jewish physics,’ Glaser marks the reign of Jewish influence from 1877 (“the beginning of the Jews’ unscrupulous invasion of German professorships in physics”) and carried it forth to 1938 (“when the November storm [that] raged throughout the land swept away the withered foliage”). On his analysis, once the dust settled from *Kristallnacht*, those Jews or part Jews who were able to survive the 1933 employment laws and the 1935 Nuremberg citizenship laws also “disappeared from the academies, libraries, lecture halls, and wherever else they had clung as supposedly indispensable persons.” Yet physical removal was not sufficient, he argued, for even though Hitler had “freed [Germany] from the

⁵¹Johannes Stark, “Die Wissenschaft versagte politisch,” *Das Schwarze Korps*, No. 28, July 15, 1937; Hentschel, 157-160. Philip Lenard also added the phrase *geistige Verjudung* (creeping Jewish mentality) to the anti-Jewishness campaign in the February 1, 1940 “Forward” to his *Kriegsschriften, der Reichsstudentenfuehrung*, Issue 2 (1940), Hentschel, 234-235.

⁵² Ludwig Glaser, “Juden in der Physik: Juedische Physik,” *Zeitschrift fuer die gesamte Naturwissenschaften*, Vol.5, No.8, November 1939, 272-275; Hentschel, 223-234.

plague of Jews” and “the Jew ha[d] stopped working in German teaching positions,” the “Jewish mentality, which ha[d] become lodged in minds,” must also “be eradicated.”

It was not only in science that eradication of Jewish influence was being argued, but virtually across the disciplines. As critical studies by Max Weinreich (1946), Herbert Rothfeder (1963), Patricia von Papen-Bodek (1999, 2004), Susannah Heschel (1999, 2008), and Alan Steinweis (2006) demonstrate, research, scholarship, and eradication of Jewish influence were the common and broadcast goals of major state or church sponsored *Judentum* research institutes established between 1935 and 1939.⁵³ According to Walter Frank, Director of the *Reichsinstitut* in Figure 6 below, the goal of National Socialist scholarship was to organize itself into a new unity of interdisciplinary “in accord with the policy on the Jewish question,” and to do so in a way that revealed anti-Semitism as a “constructive, necessary element” of the German spirit.⁵⁴

⁵³ Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People* (New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, 1946), reprint (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Herbert P. Rothfeder, "A Study of Alfred Rosenberg's Organization for National Socialist Ideology," Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1963); Patricia von Papen-Bodek, "Scholarly Antisemitism During the Third Reich: The Reichsinstitut's Research on the Jewish Question, 1935-1945" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1999); "Anti-Jewish Research and the Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage in Frankfurt am Main between 1933 and 1945," Jeffrey M. Diefendorf, ed., *Lessons and Legacies*, Vol. 6 (Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 2004), 155-89; Suzanne Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life," *Church History*, Vol.63, No.4 (Dec.1994), 587-605; "When Jesus was an Aryan," in Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, eds., *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 68-89; *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008); Alan E. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006). See also Claudia Koonz, *The Nazi Conscience* (Cambridge, Mass and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), esp. 190-220.

⁵⁴ Walter Frank, 1938 *Reichsinstitut* Conference, Munich, reported by *Reichsinstitut* staff member Dr. Clemens Hoberg in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 159 (1938-1939); Weinreich, 55-56. See also Frank's proclamation at a December 1938 *Reichsinstitut* Conference in Berlin, which was used at the end of Gerhard Kittel's 1939 book *Die historischen Voraussetzungen der juedischen Rassenmischung*: "German scholarship is in a struggle against World Judaism! 'Just as the outrage of World Judaism was followed by the political and economic counterblow of the Reich, so in scholarship there will be a reply as we continue to strengthen the antiJewish wing of our research work;' " Weinreich, 56, 59.

Figure 6. Major *Judentum* Research Institutes in Germany, 1935-1945 ⁵⁵

Names & Dates of Institutes and Journals	Location	Auspices
1. Institute for the Study of the Jewish Problem(1935) Institut zum Studium der Judenfrage Antisemitische Aktion (1939) Antijuedische Aktion (1943) Director, Wilhelm Ziegler Journal, <i>Mitteilungen ueber die Judenfrage</i> (1937-1940) <i>Die Judenfrage in Politik, Recht, Kultur und Wirtschaft</i> (1940-1943) <i>Archiv fuer Judenfragen, Schriften zue geistigen Ueberwindung des Judenthums</i> (1943-1945)	Berlin	Ministry of Propaganda
2. Reich Institute for History of the New Germany (10.1935) Reichsinstitut fuer Geschichte des neuen Deutschland Director, Walter Frank (1935-1941)	Berlin	Ministry of Education
3. Research Department for the Jewish Problem (4.1936) Branch of Reich Institute for History of New Germany Forshungsabteilung Judenfrage Director, Wilhelm Grau (1935-1938), Karl R. Ganzer (1938-1941), Erich Botzenhart (1943-1945) Volume Series, <i>Forschungen zur Judenfrage</i> (1937)	Munich	Ministry of Education
4. Institute for Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on the German Church (4.1939) Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des juedischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben Academic Director, Walter Grundmann; (Titular) Director, Siegfried Leffler Symposium Report, <i>Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum</i>	Eisenach	Evangelische Landeskirchen
5. International Institute for Clarification of the Jewish Problem (1939) Welt-Dienst. Internationales Institut zur Aufklaerung ueber die Judenfrage Director, August Schirmer	Bad Schwalbach	Alfred Rosenberg, NSDAP
6. Institute for Research into the Jewish Problem (4.1939) Public Opening 1941 Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage Director, Wilhelm Grau (7.1940-10.1942), Otto Paul, Klaus Schickert (10.1943-1945) Journal, <i>Der Weltkampf: Die Judenfrage in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>	Frankfurt	Alfred Rosenberg, NSDAP

⁵⁵ Name changes at the 1935 Ministry of Propaganda's Institute for the Study of the Jewish Problem are a reflection of the ongoing unsettledness about what to call the Nazi contraposition to Jews and Jewishness. Tables VI and VII, compiled from the scholarship of Max Weinreich, were later updated according to the more recent research of Patricia von Papen-Bodek; see previous citation.

Scholars of both Catholic and Protestant persuasion were drawn from German universities and academies to fill appointments at the *Judentumforschungen Institute*, and they were often people of “high standing” like the Nobel Laureates Lenard and Stark.⁵⁶ Overriding any disciplinary or organizational differences were the common aims of presenting antisemitism as a justified reaction to Jewish instigation and representing antisemitic legislation as the Reich’s method of self defense.⁵⁷ Using the academic practices of scientific, philosophical, and historical reasoning, documentation, statistics, tables, charts, maps, workshops, journals, and conferences, institute participants not only derived scholarly justifications for antisemitism and antisemitic legislation, they translated their justifications into forms and language accessible to the German public, such as newspaper articles, public talks, and radio addresses. In addition to the primary research institutions, “each profession and academic field...had one or more ‘research’ centers” aimed at the same goals.”⁵⁸ There was also inter-organizational collaboration between the institutes and the smaller centers, often in the form of conferences, and with the understanding - as stated in the keynote address at the 1936 Conference on Jewry in Jurisprudence - that the aim was to “free the German spirit from all Jewish falsification.” Here, as whenever research aims

⁵⁶Initial appointments to the *Reichsinstitut* Research Department for the Jewish Problem, for example, consisted of fifteen scholars. “Prof. Dr. Johannes Alt, Wuerzburg, history of literature; Prof. Dr. Hans Bogner, Freiburg, ancient history; Dir. Gen. Dr. Rudolf Buttmann, Munich, library science; Prof. Dr. Hans Alfred Grunsky, Munich, history of philosophy; Prof. Dr. Gerhard Kittel, Tuebingen, Talmudic research; Prof. Dr. Philipp Lenard, Heidelberg, natural sciences; Dr. Ottokar Lorenz, economic history; Prof. Dr. Herbert Meyer, Goettingen, legal history; Dr. Wilhelm Stapel, Hamburg, history of literature; Prof. Dr. Rudolf Tomaschek, Dresden School of Technology, natural sciences; Professor Dr. Max Wundt, Tuebingen, history of philosophy; Dr. Wilhelm Ziegler, Berlin, political history.” Section heads were also appointed for the Jewish problems of Eastern Europe, Russia, Palestine, Romance-speaking and Anglo-Saxon countries. Johannes Stark was added to the line up in 1937. Weinrich, 5-22, 47-48; Steinweiss, 7-22, von Papen-Bodek, 5, 267.

⁵⁷ von Papen-Bodek, 267, 271; Steinweiss, 137; Weinreich, 59.

⁵⁸ Heschel, 104. See Weinreich, 68, who reports that Eduard Hermann, Dean of German Linguistics at Goettingen, phrased it thus in 1939: “Today National Socialism knocks at the door of every scholarly discipline and asks: what have you to offer me?.”

were discussed, emphasis was placed on the “present battle situation in the ideological contest with Jewry.”⁵⁹

At the heart of this perceived battle was historical documentation of the origins and manifestations of the Jewish Question in western society.⁶⁰ Historian Walter Frank, under whose direction the *Reichsinstitut* “looked on itself at the center of anti-Semitism in German science,” explained such historical research in November 1936 as forging the weapons with which the struggle against Jewry would be conducted. Wilhelm Grau, whose “Jewish Question as a Task of Historical Research” was distributed in pamphlet form at the *Reichsinstitut* inauguration in October 1935, had broadcast much the same in a radio address at the opening of its Jewish Department in Munich in April 1936.⁶¹ Speaking as Director of the Department and as an historian actively involved in proving the historicity of the Jewish Question, he emphasized the

⁵⁹ University Instructors Group of the National Socialist Lawyers Union Conference, October 3-4, 1936. Proceedings were published in a pamphlet series entitled “Das Judentum in Rechtswissenschaft;” Weinrich 39-40.

⁶⁰ The idea behind such research was not novel. Peter Schaefer, in *Judeophobia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), reports that after the term and concept of antisemitism was established “most German historians” after Trietschke were “openly preoccupied” with the task of finding vindication for modern antisemitism in the ancient sources. He points to a number of examples, including the 1886 work of Arthur G. Sperling, who claimed that the Alexandrian grammarian Apion was ‘the greatest agitator against the Jews in antiquity’.” Although Schaefer excludes Theodore Mommsen from intentionally looking for antisemitic vindication, he says that Mommsen inadvertently contributed to the thesis of universal hatred by declaring in his *Roemische Geschichte* that “hatred of Jews and Jew-baiting are as old as the Diaspora itself.” Konrad Zacher moved a step beyond Mommsen in 1898 by propagating the claim that anti-Semitism “is as old as Judaism itself and the Jewish Diaspora.” The thesis was furthered by Fritz Staehelin in 1905 when he concluded that “the essence of Judaism ...could only have met with repulsion by the naturally tolerant Greeks.” By 1921, Schaefer says, both Eduard Meyer and Hugo Willrich had moved beyond both Mommsen and Zacher, having omitted the reference to the Diaspora altogether, simply declaring that hatred of the Jews “is as old as Judaism itself.” The historian Hugo Willrich was an early member of NSDAP and from about 1925 he was involved with Achim Gercke’s project to document names and numbers of Jewish professors in German universities.

⁶¹ Wilhelm Grau, April 29, 1936 radio address, von Papen-Bodek, 204.

importance of such work by arguing that “nothing could better explain the ‘universal validity of German anti-Jewish legislation.’”

Both the presumption and the outcome of such research, in other words, hinged on belief in the existence of an historical world Jewish problem, and it was this commonality that linked the various disciplinary findings together. The resulting ‘evidence’ substantiating what scholars set out to find was foundational to all Nazi arguments against Jews for it verified the historical *continuity* of the alleged Jewish threat on which Nazi antisemitism based its racial claims. Such claims were wholly dependent not only on the location of *some* antecedents in previous centuries but on an unceasing stream of antiJewish manifestations demonstrating that Jews were resisted and hated wherever they presented in western history. Vital to this project - in fact, necessary - were two thousand years of Christian teachings, legislation, and actions against Jews. Just as Wilhelm Marr had used that history to transform the connotative characteristics of *Judenthum* into characteristics of *Semitismus*, so did Nazi scholars chronicle the historical Christian stance against Jews as proofs of both the ongoing Jewish problem and the historical development of justified anti-Semitism.

And this they did thoroughly, for at almost every turn in the secondary literature on the institutes and their scholars is one or another of the Christian teachings at the heart of this study. Of three influential scholars whose work will serve as guide to the Nazi versions, the first is Gerhard Kittel, a New Testament scholar at Tuebingen who joined the Nazi party in May 1933. He was one of the original 1935 appointees to the *Reichsinstitut* Department for the Jewish Problem, the most frequently published scholar in the Department’s *Forshungen zur Judenfrage* volumes, and consultant to Goebbel’s Ministry of Propaganda Institute for the Study of the Jewish Problem in Berlin. In June of 1933, in a public lecture at Tuebingen entitled “Die Judenfrage,” he reviewed four possible solutions to Germany’s Jewish problem - extermination,

assimilation, Zionism, and guest status - opting for the latter as being most feasible.⁶² The pressure of guest status, he speculated, would cause Jews to turn from modern secular materialism and return to “authentic Jewry,” placing them once again in their assigned role as the “wandering Jew, the sign of God’s punishment.”⁶³ In 1936, in an essay entitled “The Origins of Jewry and Origins of the Jewish Question,” Kittle expounded the claim that historically “the Jewish people, race, and religion posed an enduring problem to other peoples” because they saw themselves as a “People of World Domination (*Volk der Weltherrschaft*).” In the same essay, and again in 1943, he took up the well-worn theme of Jewish hatred, claiming respectively that Jews “regarded non-Jews as an ‘antiGod’ who ought to be ‘exterminated,’” and that Jews “harbor[ed] a deeply rooted ‘fundamental hatred of non-Jews,’” which, he said, was a Talmudic-encouraged hatred that allowed them “‘full freedom to kill’ nonJews.”⁶⁴

Where Kittel focused on Jewish hatred of non-Jews, however, Wilhelm Grau focused on nonJewish hatred of Jews, claiming that historical instantiations of such should be seen as anti-Semitic antecedents. And where Kittel “took pains in proving that the century and a half of Jewish emancipation should be considered a historical mistake,”⁶⁵ Grau spent his career in the development of documentation projects that emphasized why emancipation was an historical mistake and why suppression of Jews was critical to the safety of western society. As Director of the *Reichsinstitut* Jewish Department from its inception in 1936 until April 1938, and Director of Alfred Rosenberg’s Institute for Research into the Jewish Question from 1940 until drafted into

⁶² „Die Judenfrage“ was later published as a 78 page booklet. Alan Steinweiss, 66-76; Susannah Heschel, 184-188; Weinreich, 41-45. For fuller treatment of Kittel, see Robert Ericksen’s standard study *Theologians Under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus, and Emanuel Hirsch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

⁶³ Steinweis, 69-71.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 72-75.

⁶⁵ Weinreich, 41.

the military in late 1942, Grau's work was instrumental in developing Nazi scholarship's justification for antiJewish legislation. He did this by drawing on ancient, medieval, and early modern Christian teachings and legislation against Jews as antecedent justifications for Nazi suppression of Jews.⁶⁶ Indeed, any and all historical antiJewish sentiments were harvested as dual evidence of Jewish fault and nonJewish expression of an earlier antisemitism. The acts and sentiments of canons, councils, synods, canons, Visigoth legislation, crusades, expulsions, persecutions, Inquisition, Reformation, Enlightenment, emancipation, and wars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries rendered to him three fundamental conclusions. 1) Wherever Jews had settled so had the Jewish problem; 2) "from antiquity to present, all peoples had recognized the Jews as dangerous;" and 3) Jews had "exploited and used emancipation to achieve a destructive and political influence." He summarized his historical findings as such in March 1941 when delivering his radio broadcast address at the inauguration of Alfred Rosenberg's Frankfurt Institute for Research into the Jewish problem.⁶⁷

Like Gerhard Kittle, under whom he received a doctorate at University of Tuebingen, Walter Grundmann, now Professor of Theology at Jena, also expounded "the eternal hatred of Jews toward the whole nonJewish world," as part of an "historical vindication and justification of Germany's struggle against Jewry."⁶⁸ But the exposition of Jewish hatred was not the main thrust of his overall work. Grundmann's section of the 1942 two-author book quoted characteristically elaborated the "tendency of Jews to appropriate every sublime idea, including Christianity."⁶⁹ As

⁶⁶ von Papen-Bodek, 186-240, esp. 189-191; Weinreich, 48-50.

⁶⁷ Ibid., especially 157-158, 188-198, 204, 225-227.

⁶⁸ Karl Friedrich Euler and Walter Grundmann, *Das religioese Gesicht des Judentums, Entstehung und Art* (Leipzig, 1942), Weinreich, 66.

⁶⁹ According to a 1943 peer review in *Europaesscher Wissenschafts-Dienst* III by Professor Wilhelm Koepp at University of Greifswald; Weinreich, 66.

Academic Director of the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on the German Church, his focus on the Judaizing tendency of Jews is of studied importance, for, as Susannah Heschel's research indicates, the Institute's founding and development cannot be fully understood outside of the broader context of Nazi country-wide calls for the dejudaization of Germany. Indeed, according to competing plans submitted to Reich Bishop Ludwig Mueller and Hermann Muhs, State Secretary at the Ministry for Church Affairs, the Institute came about as a result of - to use Grundmann's words - "the dejudaization process being executed in all segments of German life."⁷⁰

As effort to remove every vestige of Jewishness from German life had increased throughout the disciplines, Christianity had come under increasing attack as being itself irreparably Judaized.⁷¹ Hugo Pich, a retired church superintendent, later known as the "spiritual

⁷⁰ Heschel, *Aryan Jesus*, 11, 24, 75-78, 86-87; quotation, 80.

⁷¹ Nazi claims of Judaized Christianity can be profitably viewed in the context of historical Christian claims against Judaizing. As ancient and medieval documents make clear, wherever European populations were Christianized the warning was present that where Jews were free to do so, they exercised Judaizing influence to the detriment of truth and Christianity. The perceived threat was not only that Christian truth and the foundations of the church would be subverted by Jews, but that Christians themselves would be dangerously changed into harbors of Jewish thought. Being Judaized, or being turned into Jews, as church fathers warned, was perceived as not only taking on Jewish thought, but taking it and Judaizing others so that anti-truth would spread like an insidious disease under the guise of truth. After Reformation factions accused one another of Judaizing crimes against Christian truth, reports Louis Newman, "almost every new religious movement [of Christian persuasion] was stigmatized in tendency as Judaic," whether on the Continent, England, or America. By the Enlightenment, some of those versed in this ever-expanding history began to argue that the whole of Christianity was in need of dejudaization. The first German Protestant "to call for a dejudaizing of Christian theology for theological reasons" was the scholar Johann Semler, whose works emanating from Halle was widely influential. Arguing in 1771-1776 on the grounds that the "enmity and hate" between Judaism and Christianity "is not only allowed but also an obligation and necessity," Semler called for the New Testament to be cleansed of Jewish ideas and the Old Testament to be regarded as "belonging to a past national religion." Following on Semler's heels was the Lutheran theologian-philosopher Fichte at Jena, who argued between 1804 and 1806 that Christianity and its Jewish gospels had to be dejudaized. Paul de Lagarde, a New Testament scholar appointed to full professor at Goettingen in 1869, followed in kind, proclaiming the "spiritual bankruptcy of Christianity," which was "doomed to extinction" because of [its] Jewish elements." He had repudiated the idea that the Jewish question was more a matter of biology than of spirit as early as 1853, arguing over the years that, as "carriers of decay," Jews "pollute every national culture [and] exploit the human and material resources of their hosts" to obtain domination. "Every Jew is proof of the enfeeblement of our national life," he warned, and of the worthlessness of what we call the Christian religion." After Lagarde, says Steven Ascheim, "it

father” of the Institute, began drafting proposals in 1937 for a dejudaising institute that would delimit antiChristian attacks while preserving Christianity, as Christianity was understood by the predominant German Christian sector of the German Protestant Church.⁷² Pich’s last proposal in October 1938 stimulated a working conference on November 7 and 8 to discuss the German Christian approach to Germany’s dejudaization project. As it turned out, the conference ended just before *Kristallnacht* commenced, and within a week of that November 9 country-wide burning of synagogues, Martin Sasse, German Christian Bishop of Thuringia, issued a truncated version of Martin Luther’s *On the Jews and Their Lies*, pointing out in its Preface that “Luther demanded that fire should be set to synagogues and Jewish schools.”⁷³ On the same date, November 15, Gerhard Hahn, an influential German Christian in Berlin, began circulating Pich’s

became commonplace to argue that Christians had become weakened and corrupted through Judaization of the church.” Of the growing numbers who did, three were especially instrumental in propagating and passing the notion along to the twentieth century: Wilhelm Marr, whose 1879 *Judaized Christianity* served as the vehicle for Semitism’s Judaizing of western culture; Eugen Duehring, whose many writings from 1877 until his death in 1883 argued that Christianity was so judaized that a Jewish question would still exist even if every Jew stopped being a Jew; and Friedrich Nietzsche, who argued in a series of books from 1878 to 1889 that Christianity was the “secret black art of Jewish grand politics of revenge,” the “art of holy lying” in which “the whole of Judaism...attains its ultimate perfection.” The idea that Judaized Christianity must be excised was further disseminated by the antisemitic newspaper *Antisemitische Correspondenz*, founded in 1885 and published under various names until 1924, and multiple editions of *Antisemitic Catechism*, first published in 1887 through the end of WWII, but with the 1907 name change *Handbuch der Judenfrage*. See Louis Newman, 2; Anders Gerdman, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, From Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 39-49; Paul Lawrence Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, 122; Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 40, 61; Steven Asheim, “The Jew Within,” 233; Nietzsche, *Genealogy of Morals*, I.8; *Anti-Christ*, 44; Uriel Tal, 264-266, 271-273.

⁷² Ibid., 75-76. The German Protestant Church was split into two main factions during the Third Reich. German Christians (*Deutsche Christen*), who sought to integrate National Socialist policies and ideology into the church, and the Confessing Church (*Bekennende Kirche*), who insisted that the church retain its autonomy. By July 1933 German Christians had gained the majority in national church elections, retaining “control in most of the regional churches in Germany throughout the Third Reich.” By 1937 German Christians comprised half of lectureships in Protestant theological faculties at the universities, a third of all professorships, and all of the deanships; Heschel, “Nazifying Christian Theology,” 587-589. See also Doris Bergen *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), esp. 142-171.

⁷³ Martin Sasse, *Martin Luther and the Jews* (Boring, Oregon: CPA Book Publishers, 1938 reprint).

proposal with a cover letter linking *Kristallnacht* to “the general cleansing of German racial life of everything Jewish,” saying that the time to act “had arrived.” A week later on November 21 and again in March of the following year, Grundmann submitted proposals that more specifically and more thoroughly addressed the urgency for an academic means through which Christianity could account for and remove “any possible Jewish influence within its own history.” This was followed by a series of meetings which eventually led a consortium of regional German Christian church representatives to issue a formal declaration on April 4, 1939, proclaiming “that National Socialism carried forward the work of Martin Luther and would lead the German people to a true understanding of Christian faith.” The “centerpiece” of this Godesberg Declaration, signed by eleven regional churches, Heschel points out, “was the statement...[that] Christianity is the unbridgeable religious opposition to Judaism.” As described in a newspaper article shortly after the signing, the new organization was charged with the “termination of even the last hideout of Jewish cultural pollution.”⁷⁴

In order to understand the dejudaizing process that Grundmann said was “being executed in all spheres of German life,” one has to begin to grasp how deeply embedded was the belief that German life was Judaized. Yet to attempt to understand either of the Third Reich issues of Judaization and dejudaization without placing them squarely in the context of Nazi claims about *juedische Weltherrschaft* is to ignore the force of this well-worn thesis. All Nazi claims about Judaization - whether a Judaized Christianity, a Judaized science, or a Judaized Germany - were always linked to the broader claim of Jewish intention toward domination. When the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life was formally launched on May 6, 1939, to stay with the present illustration, Grundmann’s keynote address made clear that

⁷⁴ Heschel, *Aryan Jesus*, 77-87; “Nazifying Christian Theology,” 590-591. The Declaration was “printed in the official Gesetzblatt (statute book) of the German Protestant Church with an addendum stating the church’s intention to implement the Declaration by establishing [the Institute].”

the Jewish destruction of *voelkisch* thought and ideas went hand in hand with the Jewish struggle for world dominion. The dejudaizing work of the Institute was thus projected to not only cleanse Christianity of its Jewish pollution but to thwart Jewish intentions of domination on the spiritual plane.⁷⁵ Fully consistent with this thinking, four months later on September 8 - after Germany invaded Poland (September 1) and England and France responded by declaring war on Germany (September 3) - Grundmann placed the dejudaizing work of the Institute in the service of a German defensive war against the aggressions of world Jewry.⁷⁶

In a moment in which world Jewry in its hatred of the German Volk has struck a decisive blow, and the German Volk is placed in a struggle for its right and its life, I turn to you as leader of the academic work of the de-Judaization Institute... [with the assurance that] we are engaged in the work of this institute in the conviction that Jewish influence on all areas of German life must be exposed and broken..

According to Heschel, from its onset Grundmann and other “Institute leaders saw the war as the aggressive efforts of Jews to achieve world domination,” and leaders “used their positions as professors of theology to bring historical ‘proof’ to bear on the claims.” In 1940, for example, New Testament scholar Georg Bertram (University of Giessen) ‘proved’ “that the goal of Jewish assimilation is to decompose a society and then take control over it,” and Jena theologian Wolf Meyer-Erlach’s historical account of England becoming wholly Judaized during the Reformation ‘proved’ why England declared war on Germany.⁷⁷ Other scholars in committees were energetically engaged in the work of dejudaizing Christian liturgical materials, producing a dejudaized New Testament in 1940, a dejudaized Christian hymnal in 1941, and a dejudaized

⁷⁵ Ibid, *Aryan Jesus*, 90 and 68.

⁷⁶ Ibid., Letter to Hans Kerrl, Reich Minister for Ecclesiastic Affairs, “Nazifying Christian Theology,” 594.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 596- 598. This was the case throughout the war even after Grundmann entered active military in 1943. Georg Bertram, Academic Director in March 1944, restated that the “war is the fight of Judaism against Europe,” insisting that the truth of Jewish aggressions is confirmed “over and over again...by the research of the Institute.”

catechism the same year, each of which “translated” Institute research “into concepts accessible to laypeople, soldiers...and Nazi leaders who were skeptical of Christianity’s relevance to their antiJewish campaign.”⁷⁸

Demonstrating that the war was forced on Germany by the aggressions of world Jewry was also taken up by the historians of the *Reichsinstitut*,⁷⁹ its Research Department for the Jewish Problem, the other *Judenthum* institutions, and the new Institute for Research into the Jewish Problem in Frankfurt, founded by Alfred Rosenberg in 1939 and headed by Wilhelm Grau in 1940.⁸⁰ Moreover, a network of *Ostforschung* historians, as described by Konrad Jarausch, were “ready to help the Nazi project of ethnic cleansing by providing information on the nationalities-structure of the disputed Polish frontier regions.”⁸¹ The October 7, 1939 memorandum indicating this readiness of the ‘eastern research’ group, penned by a scholar who would later become a postwar president of the German Historical Association, called for, according to Alan Steinweiss, “the ‘dejewification’ of conquered territory as preparation for its colonization by German settlers.”⁸²

⁷⁸ Ibid., *Aryan Jesus*, 104, 106-111, 113-128; for other dejudaizing projects of the Institute, 129-165.

⁷⁹ Walter Frank’s Introduction to the 1940 *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* also offered the “war forced upon the German nation” as supreme evidence that the “scholarly work on research into the Jewish question constitutes one of the weightiest contributions to the spiritual rearmament of our people and to the enlightenment also of the other nations of the world.”

⁸⁰ Among other wartime projects Grau updated *Die Judenfrage in der deutschen Geschichte* in 1942 to include the accusation that Jews “launched the war, which would end only once the Jewish Question had been resolved.” Weinreich, 55; von Papen-Badeck, 157-159, 222.

⁸¹ Konrad Jarausch, “Unasked Questions: The Controversy about Nazi Collaboration among German Historians,” in Jeffrey M. Diefendorf, ed. *Lessons and Legacies*, Vol. 6 (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2004), 190-208 (quotation, 192 and 201).

⁸² The memorandum was from Theodor Schieder. Werner Conze, another of those historians who became a postwar president of the German Historical Association, as pointed out by Steinweiss, 121, published several articles between 1937 and 1940 pointing “to ‘dejewification’ as one possible option for addressing problems arising from the Jewish economic role in White Russia, Lithuania, and other parts of eastern Europe.”

By April 1940, the Cracow Institute for German Work in the East, presided over by Dr. Hans Frank, Jurist and Governor General of Poland, and directed by Jurist Dr. Wilhelm Coblitz, was up and running in occupied Poland, with branches planned for Warsaw, Radom, and Lublin. The Institute was to be the "spiritual bulwark of Germandom in the East." Its stated purpose was to "scientifically clear all fundamental questions of the Eastern space," while that of its Jewish Department, like those in Germany, was to provide material to justify German anti-Jewish policies. Research and scholarship were to be build "upon the best of German tradition," beginning with the development of historical bibliographies on eastern Jewry, the Jewish Question in Galacia and Poland, Polish antiJewish movements, and Polish antiJewish laws.⁸³ As reported by Director Coblitz in 1942, "the Jew-research at the institute is being carried on in the closest connection with the central organs of the Party and the State in the sense of totally clearing up [*Gesamtbereinigung*] the European Jewish problem."⁸⁴ As reported by *Die Judenfrage* in the same period back home in Germany, the "Jewish question of the Ostland, now under German leadership, [has]come into the sphere of fundamental, systematic, and disciplined solutions."⁸⁵ This was true also of the ten other such institutes established in areas of German expansion between 1940 and 1945 (Figure 7 below).

⁸³ The Cracow Institute Jewish Department was headed by Joseph Summerfield, whose dissertation was written on "The Jewish Question as an Administrative Problem in South Prussia." Weinreich, 95-97. See also Patricia von Papen-Badeck, "Anti-Jewish Research of the Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage in Frankfurt am Main between 1939 and 1945," 163.

⁸⁴ Ibid, Weinreich, 95-97, 185-186. According to a mid-1942 report by German journalists, "where there are still Jews in the country, they have been collected in ghettos behind barbed wire:" in cities where there had previously been Jewish populations of 80, 50, and 30 percent, "a clear atmosphere has been created through the elimination of Jewry."

⁸⁵ Ibid. By 1944 the Governor of the Radom District, Ernst Kundt, was able to report in one of the three Cracow Institute periodicals that "the Jew and half-Jew...[had been] less and less admitted to participation until he was completely isolated... partly deported [and] partly harnessed for useful work under German supervision... [so that now] it can be stated for the Government General that the Jewish question has been solved without remainder within a short time."

Figure 7. *Judentum* Research Institutes, 1935-1945, Occupied Countries⁸⁶

Names & Dates of Institutes and Journals	Location	Auspices
6. Jewish Department, Institute for German Work in the East (4.1940) Institut fuer deutsche Ostarbeit, Judenreferat Director, Wilhelm Coblitz; Referent fuer Judenfragen, Josef Sommerfeldt Journal 1, <i>Die Burg</i> (quarterly) 2, <i>Das Generalgouvernement</i> (monthly) 3, <i>Deutsche Forschung im Osten</i> (monthly)	Krakau	Hans Frank, General Governor of Poland
7. Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question (1941) Director, Guido Podaliri, Giovanni Preziosi	Ancona	Fascist Party's Racial Office
8. Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question (1941) Director, Henri Labroue	Bordeaux	RSHA, German Embassy
9. Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question (1941) Institut d'Etudes des Questions Juives Director, Paul Sezille; Supervised by SS Hauptsturmfuehrer Theodor Dannecker	Paris	RSHA, German Embassy
10. Branch, Institute for Research into the Jewish Problem (1942) Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage Director, Theologian Adolf Wendel	Lodz	Rosenberg, Ministry of Occupied Eastern Areas
11. Center for the Study of the Jewish Question (1942) Director, Alfredo Acito	Milan	Italian Ministry of Popular Culture
12. Center for the Study of the Jewish Question 1942) Director, Ugo Puccioni	Florence	Italian Ministry of Popular Culture
13. Center for the Study of the Jewish Question (1942) Fascist Centro per lo Studio Problema Ebraico Director, Ettore Martinoli	Triest	Racial Office of Ministry of Education
14. Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question (1943) Director, Mario Tirollo	Bologna	Dr. Giovanni Preziosi
15. Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question (1943-5) Institut d'Etudes des Questions Juiveset Ethno-Raciales Director, George Montandon	Paris	RHSA, German Embassy
16. Hungarian Institute for Research into the Jewish Question (1944) Director, Zoltan Bosnyak	Budapest	RSHA, Heinz Ballensiefen

⁸⁶ RSHA (*Reichssicherheitshauptamt*), Reich Central Security Office, est. in 1939 to centralize all Reich police forces, including Gestapo and SS, and to serve as central office for SS leadership and Reich Ministry of the Interior.

Just as the German *Judentumforshungen* institutes, either in collaboration with or under the direct supervision of state, party, and church officials, provided alleged legitimization to the idea that antisemitic measures were a just reaction to Jewish aggressions, so did these offshoot organizations in occupied countries.⁸⁷ Moreover, from start to finish they elaborated and propagated the thesis established by the German institutes and exemplified by Rosenberg's inaugural address at the Frankfurt Institute: "The Jewish Question as a World Problem." Because institutes in Cracow and other European locations collaborated with Rosenberg's Institute from their inception, and in fact simulated that model, and because his inaugural speech was broadcast from radio stations in Berlin, Frankfurt, Cologne, Vienna, Koenigsberg, and Weichsel,⁸⁸ it is instructive to review the emphasis being urged upon both foreign collaborators and the German population in March 1941.⁸⁹

1. The Jewish question had been an unsolved problem for European nations for 2,000 years, beginning when the first Jews immigrated to Rome.
2. The Jewish problem has multiple aspects - national cultural purity, economic and political domination, and ideological conflict - and the many aspects necessitate defense of national tradition for all nations that still value culture and the future.
3. The Jewish question will only be solved for Germany when the last Jew has left the Greater German space, and the Jewish question will only be solved for Europe when the last Jew has left the European continent.
4. The National Socialist revolution *is* the solution to the Jewish problem for both Germany and all of Europe. It not only overcomes the world of ideas of the French Revolution, it exterminates directly all those racially infecting germs of Jewry and its

⁸⁷ von Papen-Bodek, dissertation chapter F, "The *Aussenstelle's* Collaboration with European Anti-Jewish Research Institutes and the Preparations for the Anti-Jewish Congress in Cracow," 241-266, and "Anti-Jewish Research of the Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage in Frankfurt am Main between 1939 and 1945," 155, 163-170. See also Koonz, 214-215; Weinreich, 84-97, 116, 134.

⁸⁸ Ibid., von Papen-Bodek, 157.

⁸⁹ Alfred Rosenberg, "The Jewish Question as a World Problem," March 28, 1941 speech, in Roderick Stackelberg and Sally A Winkle, eds., *The Nazi Germany Sourcebook, An Anthology of Texts* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2002), 337-339.

bastards, which now for over a hundred years developed without check among the European nations; it also constitutes a cleansing biological world revolution.

5. Those nations which are still opposed to us will recognize at the end of the war that Germany's affair is the affair of the whole European continent...[as well as the affair of] all other cultured races on this globe who fight for a safe national cultural and state life.

Even a cursory glance at the breadth of the European dissemination of this message through the *Judentumforschung* institutions is sobering. In terms of the immediate outreach of Rosenberg's inaugural address, representatives from Romania, Hungary, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Holland, and Norway were among those invited by the Foreign Office to participate in a coordinated conference on antiJewish measures.⁹⁰ In addition to the country-specific center in in Table VII, Susannah Heschel reports that a dejudaizing branch of the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life was founded in the fall of 1941 by the Evangelical Church of Romania, under the direction of Bishop Wilhelm Staedel.⁹¹ The same Institute also "established itself" with the Protestant theological faculty at the University of Vienna, and implemented working groups and bi-annual conferences with academics from Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.⁹² By January 1942 the Frankfurt Institute was collaborating with Belgian, Dutch, and Danish antiJewish organizations as well as with the *Judentum* institutions in Ancona, Bordeaux, and Paris. The Director of the Bordeaux Institute, in turn, extended the reach of his antiJewish work to the Netherlands and Hungary. By April the Palestinian Grand Mufti of Jerusalem had joined the ranks of those in consultation with the Frankfurt Institute, and "Romanians as well as Croats" had requested permission to "send [research] fellows."⁹³ That

⁹⁰ von Papen-Bodek, 242 (dissertation).

⁹¹ Heschel, *Aryan Jesus*, 129-132. Eight pastors who were members of the Romanian Institute were later hand-selected by the SS to "strengthen antisemitism through their religious ministry" in Poland.

⁹² Ibid, and "Nazifying Christian Theology," 598.

⁹³ von Papen-Bodek, "Anti-Jewish Research," 163-166.

same spring, Rosenberg founded a third division to deal with the Jewish problem, the Principal Office of Supra-National Powers for the Supervision of the Entire Spiritual and Ideological Training and Education of the NSDAP, headed by Hans Hagemeyer, and in July, after being appointed Minister for the Occupied Territories in the East exactly a year earlier, he established a branch of the Frankfurt Institute in Lodz, under the direction of theologian Adolf Wendel. By the end of 1942, Italian Centers for the Study of the Jewish Question, under the auspices of Dr. Giovanni Preziosi from the Racial Office of the Fascist Party, were emulating the Frankfurt Institute in Milan, Florence, and Triest; and another was up and running in Bologna in 1943.⁹⁴

By mid May, 1944, the privately established 1942 Hungarian Institute for Research into the Jewish Question was being transfigured into a public institution under the support and purview of the Reich Central Security Office (RHSA).⁹⁵ The inaugural speech on the problem of “Jewish world conspiracy,” given by the Institute’s overseeing Judenreferent from RHSA, SS *Hauptsturmfuehrer* Dr. Heinz Ballensiefen, came in the wake of a revealing conference about the foreign proliferation of that thesis. Some five week earlier the newly formed Foreign Office *Informationstelle XIV Antijuedischer Auslandsaktionsausschuss* (Anti-Jewish Action Abroad), decreed by Foreign Minister Ribbentrop and under the leadership of I.K.Schleier, had held a working conference of Jewish specialists from diplomatic missions in France, Switzerland, Denmark, Croatia, Turkey, Spain, Italy, Rumania, Slovakia, Portugal, Sweden, Bulgaria, and Hungary.⁹⁶ The task of the new division, according to a Foreign Office “secret” document of

⁹⁴ von Papen-Bodek, “Anti-Jewish Research,” 166, 169; diss., 10, 246-250. The Racial office of the Fascist Party was apparently under the auspices of the Italian Ministry of Popular Culture. The Milan Institute, as well as the Paris Institute were actively involved, respectively, in locating Jews and “denounc[ing] Jews to the police.”

⁹⁵ Ibid., 168; 255-256. After German occupation in March 1944 the director of the Hungarian Institute “assisted in the planning and implementation of subsequent anti-Jewish decrees” and the Institute itself “was used by the RSHA and the Foreign Office to expedite their Judenaktion.”

April 28, 1944 was “to deepen and strengthen the anti-Jewish information in foreign countries” by forming a collaborating unit of Jewish experts engaged by the Foreign Office, diplomatic missions, and other Reich organizations involved in anti-Jewish work.⁹⁷ Permanent seats were to be assigned to each of the foreign country embassies, the Reich Central Security Office, Rosenberg’s Principal Office of Supra-National Powers for the Supervision of the Entire Spiritual and Ideological Training and Education of the NSDAP, the Director of the Frankfurt Institute for Research into the Jewish Question,⁹⁸ the Foreign Office Commissioner of Information, and Foreign Office divisions of American Committee, British Committee, Germany Inland II, Commercial Policy, Cultural Policy, Broadcasting Policy, and Information and Press.⁹⁹ The Judenreferent of each foreign embassy was to be responsible for procuring and submitting all materials concerning Jewish and anti-Jewish occurrences within their respective countries to a central archive, with the understanding that *Inf. XIV* would return appropriately arranged and edited materials for the “greatest possible” public dissemination.¹⁰⁰ The working conference ordered by the Foreign Minister on April 3 and 4 at the Sanssouci Hotel in Krummhuebel in Lower Silesia (Karpacz, Poland), some four hours northwest of Auschwitz and Cracow, was to

⁹⁶ The International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg), *Nazi Conspiracy & Aggression*, Vol. VI, Shofar FTP Archive File: imt/nca/nca-06/nca-06-3319-ps, p.4.

⁹⁷ Ibid., the April 28, 1944, Inf.XIV memorandum to German embassies, legations, and or consulates in Ankara, Madrid, Paris, Italy, Agram, Bern, Budapest, Lisbon, Sofia, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Tangiers, Athens, Belgrad, Brussels, The Hague, and Riga is stipulated as “Number 137 secret,” while the enclosure refers to the letter as “decree number 137.”

⁹⁸ Dr. Klaus Schickert, head of the Institute from October 1943 until the end of the war, had also been commissioned by the Foreign Office to edit a yearbook that demonstrated both the “existence of a Jewish world policy” and responsibility for the war; von Papen-Badek, 258.

⁹⁹ April 28, 1944, Inf. XIV memorandum, prev.cit., 5. See also “Confidential Minutes of Work Conference for Specialists of Jewish Questions and German Diplomatic Missions in Europe,” April 20, 1944, *Inf. XIV*, No. 118, Shofar FPT 06-3319, p. 23.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 10-11. By the end of February most of the foreign embassies had submitted “collections of anti-Jewish propaganda material” to Krummhuebel, where the archives were being installed “to insure their safety from war damage.”

clarify procedures for utilization of antiJewish materials and themes, while providing *Inf.XIV* with firsthand reports of country-specific reception of antiJewish propaganda.

That the new *antijuedische Auslandsaktionausschuss* would be working in accordance with the Fuehrer's order to protect Germany's racial foundation was made clear in Schleier's opening comments.¹⁰¹ Faith in the racial principle meant repudiation of and fighting against the "disintegrating and destructive influence and activity of Jewry," and, in this context, the Fuehrer had given "instructions to take up the fight against Jewry at an intensified rate and to explain its part in the present war."¹⁰² To accomplish this work in foreign countries, Schleier instructed, it "would have to take place from the inside to the outside, and vice versa," by which he meant, antiJewish information would have to be collected from within the countries and forwarded out to the new division, who would rework and return the material in a format appropriate for country-specific exploitation.¹⁰³ The information to be collected by the Judenreferent was to consist of "all spheres of life which are influenced by Jews," including all speeches and expressions of opinion on the Jewish problem, press and radio reports about Jewish events in enemy countries and Jewish camps, instances of antiJewish tendencies, photographs of Jewish personalities, pictures of Jewish life, as well as antijewish films, publications, and comics. Once the country-specific material had been worked over by *Inf.XIV* and returned to its foreign embassy, it was to be covertly disseminated through press, radio, handbills, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, stickers, postcards, and "channels of whispering propaganda."

¹⁰¹ Ibid., I.K.Schleier, "Missions and Goals of Anti-Semitic Work in Foreign Countries," 11-12, 19; also Drs. Mahr, Haussmann, Walz, 14.

¹⁰² This is consistent with Christopher Browning's summation about the period between September 1939 and October 1941: that "not a single significant change in Nazi Jewish policy occurred without [Hitler's] intervention and approval." Christopher Browning, with contributions by Juergen Matthaeus, *The Origins of the Final Solution: The Evolution of Nazi Jewish Policy, September 1939-March 1942* (Lincoln, Neb. and Jerusalem: University of Nebraska Press and Yad Vashem, 2004), 425.

¹⁰³ See "Reports of Jewish Specialists of Diplomatic Missions," 15-19, for country-specific strategies.

All of the reworked materials were to be put to the common use of informing and preparing foreign populations for the advancement of German policies against Jews. Legation Councilor Dr. von Thadden, Foreign Office Division of Germany Inland II, much of whose “Survey of the Current Position with Regard to Anti-Semitic Governmental Measures” was stricken from the minutes because of its confidential nature, set out the guiding principles for those charged with dispersing approved *Inf. XIV* materials. The first was cautionary, and the remaining two invoked the strategy behind the intensified campaign.¹⁰⁴

1. Any suppression of antiJewish propaganda would likely “slow or handicap German executive measures.”
2. All nations are to be prepared so that they can comprehend executive measures against Jewry.
3. Constant reports about the possibility of carrying out more severe measures against Jewry and constant reports about signs of opposition actions by World Jewry will enable us to take countermeasures in time.

The principle that was to inform this preparation of nations to comprehend and accept German policies against Jews was stipulated by the Foreign Office Commissioner of Information, Legation Council Dr. Kutscher, who urged that each foreign mission was “to bring certain facts to the attention of the people until they are finally convinced of them,” namely the six theses that

1. Jews are the instigators of this war.
2. Jews drove the nations into the war.
3. Jews are the misfortune of all the peoples.
4. A Jewish victory would mean the end of all culture.
5. Germany does not only fight the Jews for itself, but for all European culture.
6. The Jew dug his own grave by causing this war.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., von Thadden, “The Political Situation in Europe with Regard to the Jewish Question: A Survey of the Current Position with Regard to Anti-Semitic Governmental Measures,” 13-14. References to the addresses of both von Thadden and *SS Hauptsturmfuehrer* Dr. Ballensiefen carried the notation that “On account of their secret nature, the [details of] statements have not been entered in the minutes.”

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 15. Kutscher, “Propaganda Themes within the Scope of Anti-Semitic Work Abroad.” See Appendix A for the complete conference schedule of twenty five addresses and reports by *Inf.XIV* members and foreign embassy Jewish experts.

All of this - both strategy and theses - is consistent with Jeffrey Herf's study of the accelerated anti-Jewish campaign being propagandized through print media to Germans during the same period.¹⁰⁶ By the end of 1933 the German free press had been completely dismantled and all journalistic activities had been placed under the auspices of Joseph Goebbels's Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda (RMVP).¹⁰⁷ Within Goebbels's Ministry, the Reich Press Office controlled the daily, weekly, and monthly German press. At the heart of this control was Reich Press Chief Dr. Otto Dietrich,¹⁰⁸ who worked in Hitler's Berlin office and, later, in his east Prussian war compound on a daily basis, briefing him each morning on international foreign press articles and receiving in return Hitler's explicit or implicit input on the day's directive to some three thousand daily German newspapers. *Die Parole des Tages* (Word of the Day) was then announced at a daily press conference for some hundred and fifty journalists, held each noon in the Propaganda Ministry, before being sent by teletype to the *Gauleiter* regional press and propaganda offices, which in turn relayed the directives to newspapers within their districts. A

¹⁰⁶ This is not to say that the campaign excluded radio and film but that Herf's study focuses primarily on print media. Jeffrey Herf, *Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda during World War II and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006); "The 'Jewish War': Goebbels and the Antisemitic Campaigns of the Nazi Propaganda Ministry," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, V19 N1 (Spring 2005), 51-80.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 18. Dismantling of the free press began with the purging of some 2000 suspected enemy journalists and the closing of some 235 newspapers. The October 4 1933 Editorial Control Law banned Jews and those married to Jews from journalism, placed remaining newspapers and editors under Reich control, required editors to become members of the Reich League of the German Press, and established League courts to punish violations. On December 12, 1933 German press services were merged to form the official German News Agency, *Deutsches Nachrichtenbuero* (DNB), under the auspices of the Reich Press Office in Goebbels's Propaganda Ministry. For the context in which this occurred, see Schleunes, *Twisted Road to Auschwitz*, 92-115.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., Herf, 18, 24. Dietrich had been Hitler's personal press adviser since 1929 and Director of the Nazi Party Press Office since 1931. In addition to being Reich Press Chief from 1933 to 1945, he was appointed Vice President of the Reich Press Chamber and Chairman of Reich League of the German Press in 1933. In 1938 he was made State Secretary of the Press Division in the Propaganda Ministry and President of the Reich Press Chamber. On April 14, 1949, largely on the basis of press directives issued between 1933 and 1945, the Nuremberg Military Tribunal Ministries Trial pronounced Dietrich guilty of "implement[ing], furnishing excuses and justification, [and] participat[ing] in the crimes against humanity regarding Jews;" 272-273.

similar method was used for the weekly *Zeitschriften-Dienst* (Periodical Service) press directives to four to six thousand periodicals, which touted “a circulation of between seventy and ninety million readers.” These daily and weekly directives, as Herf reveals, “told the press which stories it should cover, how it should present them, what language to use, and what sources of information to draw on.”¹⁰⁹

On Sept 3, 1939, the day England and France answered Germany’s aggressions on Poland by declaring war, Hitler had declared in his broadcast speech that “our Jewish-democratic world enemy succeeded in inciting the English people to a state of war against Germany.” On the same day, Dietrich informed the assembled press in Berlin that journalists were no longer just reporters but “soldiers of the German people” with the mission of “convey[ing] Hitler’s will and determination.” The confidential daily directives - the disclosure of which would be prosecuted as crime - were to distinguish the arguments around which journalists were to construct their wartime editorials and articles.¹¹⁰ Antisemitic themes prevalent in Hitler’s writings and speeches prior to and after taking office - international Jewry as the ‘eternal world enemy’ bent on world domination and Nazism as the struggle against the resulting Jewish chains of slavery - were now distilled in directives to explain every stage of the war. The Periodical Service directive for the week of September 23, entitled “Judas Krieghetze in England,” for example, “instructed editors to hold Jews, with their incitement, responsible for the English declaration of war.” On August 7, 1940, as Jews were fleeing the summer German aggressions in Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, and France, the Periodical Service directed editors to speak of “the liberation of Europe from Jewish domination.” On June 22, 1941, in his “Proclamation to the German People,”

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 24-25.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 58-60. Editors in Chief were to be held responsible for confidentiality and destruction of directives, which were to be documented as burned or shredded within six months.

Hitler announced the German invasion of the Soviet Union as a “decision to invade the ‘Jewish Bolsheviks’ who were “involved in an ‘encirclement policy’ with England.” The following August 8 Periodical Service directive, entitled “Fight World Jewry!,” then provided editors with a description of World War II as a “struggle driven by world Jewry’s immeasurable hatred against Aryan peoples, their spirit, their worldview, and their culture.”¹¹¹

What does world Jewry seek? For thousands of years, it has aimed at nothing but Jewish world domination. The goal was already present in the Old Testament of the Jews, religiously hidden but clearly evident. Repeatedly over the centuries the Jew appeared close to his goal, but then again and again the Aryan peoples put the Jews in their place. Today Jewry again seeks world domination. That British and American plutocrats on the one hand, and Bolsheviks on the other appear with apparently distinct political goals is only Jewish camouflage. The Jew strives for world domination in order to rob and plunder the world for his exclusive benefit, without distraction or hindrance.

In early 1943, with the tide turning against Germany in the war at Stalingrad, Herf reports that by way of daily orders from Hitler, Dietrich and his staff “issued press directives calling for [the] printing [of] an unprecedented amount of anti-Semitic propaganda in the thousands of German newspapers and periodical subject to the control of the press office.” Representative directives from 1943 and 1944 speak for themselves about the content of that “unprecedented amount,” which Herf describes as “the most intense and sustained barrage of anti-Semitic broadcasts, headlines, and articles in the daily and periodical press of the entire period of World War II and the Holocaust.”¹¹²

April 29, 1943, Periodical Service Press Directive

...the deadly enemy of the world must be constantly exposed and denounced... from now on it is the duty of the press to apply itself with greater intensity to the Jewish question as its permanent duty... the point...is to build up anti-Semitism in all

¹¹¹ Ibid., September 23, 1939, 58; August 7, 1940, 68; June 22, 1941, 90; August 8, 1941, 114-115.

¹¹² Ibid., 181-183; April 29, 1943, 204-206; May 5, 1943, 207-209; March 2, 1944, 241; April 27, 1944, 244-245.

commentaries and articles...With this in mind, the newspapers will receive a Jewish theme daily, one that should not be seized upon rigidly and unimaginatively but rather should serve only as inspiration....In every case it must be established that the Jews are to blame! The Jews wanted the war! Everywhere throughout the world, the Jews prepared the war against Germany! The Jew intensifies the war! The Jew profits from the war! And again and again: the Jew is guilty!

May 5, 1943, Reich Propaganda Directate to *Gau, Kreis, and Ortsgruppenleiter* Organizations¹¹³

In Germany, we made the whole nation anti-Semitic. We did so by repeatedly pointing our finger at the Jews, even as they tried to camouflage themselves.... In the wave of meetings [to be organized by the Nazi party] in the near future, the Jewish question now must be the constant key point of all presentations. Every German must know that everything he or she must endure - the discomforts, restrictions, extra hours at work, bloody terror toward women and children, and the bloody losses on the field of battle - is to be traced back to the Jews.

March 2 1944, Word of the Day Press Directive

The anti-Semitic campaign must more emphatically...be placed in the foreground and made an important propaganda factor in the world struggle... At every opportunity the background driving forces of world Jewry, which works against the interests of the host peoples, should be nailed down... German journalists must set the goal of keeping alive in the German people the feeling for the Jewish world danger...

April 27, 1944, Word of the Day Press Directive¹¹⁴

(Reports on) measures against the Jews (in Hungary must be) accompanied by extensive presentation of the crimes committed by the Jews, the consequences of which are the current measures. (In reports about the current measures taken against the Jews by) the Hungarian government, (the press should examine) the previous Jewification of Hungary which led to the implementation of the anti-Jewish measures. (German newspapers) must therefore establish that the Jews were Hungary's misfortune, [that] they subordinated the true national Hungary, and [that] it is the Jews alone who are responsible for the fact that today the Bolsheviks are standing at Hungary's door...

As we now know, for the Hungarian Jews referred to in the April 28, 1944 directive, as for all European Jews 'acquired' by German expansion and occupation, it was as a Jurist

¹¹³ The May 5, 1943 directive, "The Jewish Question as a Domestic and Foreign Policy Weapon," was issued through the subordinate hierarchy of regional (*Gauleiter*), city (*Kreisleiter*), and local (*Ortsgruppenleiter*) leaders. By 1943 this organization structure, Herf says, consisted of "43 *Gaue*, 869 *Kreise*, 26,103 *Ortsgruppen*, 106, 168 *Zellen*, and 559,020 block and neighborhood groups seeking to reach a population of about 80 million;" 19-20, 25.

¹¹⁴ Herf's words are in parentheses, mine are brackets.

academic associated with Walter Frank's *Reichsinstitut* had said in his 1942 book, *Die Juden und die Justiz*:¹¹⁵

Fate had decided upon these Jews the very moment the territory became part of the Greater German Reich. The execution of the de-Judaization was only a matter of time.

¹¹⁵Dr. Sievert Lorentzen, *Die juden und die Justiz* (Hamburg, 1942), was speaking in general of the policy inherent in German expansion while referring at the time to "Jews on territories acquired by 'peaceful' means;" Weinreich, 87.

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION:
THE SILENCE OF NON-INTERFERENCE

On March 9th and 10th, 1933, thirty nine days after Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany and four days after his rule was strengthened by German election on March 5, “bands of Nazis throughout Germany carried out wholesale raids to intimidate the perceived opposition, particularly the Jews.”¹ According to an eyewitness report in the *Chicago Tribune*, Jews were “insulted, punched in the face, hit over the head with blackjacks, and dragged from their homes in night clothes.” As coverage of violence increased throughout March, the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches in America, a major participant in the growing world ecumenical movement, released a statement on March 24 which was published in *The New York Times* the following day, calling “the reported persecution of Jews in Germany...a concern of all men of brotherly ideals.” The statement went on to say that the Federal Council had confidence that the churches of Germany would “repudiate and oppose the current anti-Semitism within their borders.”² As it turned out, by the time the statement was picked up by the world press, Germany had already called for a state-wide boycott of Jewish businesses on March 26, and the statement itself became part of a heyday of international criticism when the German church failed to repudiate the state action.

¹ Deborah Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945* (New York and London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1985), cites extensive international coverage in March 1933; 12-14, 284-286.

² “Statement of Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,” March 24, 1933; *New York Times*, page 10, March 25 (WCC, 301.43.17.1).

The immediate response by leadership of the German Protestant Church was to send “a barrage of cablegrams” to the Federal Council of Churches and other ecumenical organizations, urging that they “not assume too much or believe the exaggerated reports coming out of Germany.” Herman Kapler, President of the *Kirchenausschuss* and, since 1930, Chairman of the Continental Division of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work,³ implored the ecumenical community in America, Europe, and England to use its influence to quell “false reports” against Germany. He also warned that “ecclesiastical circles protesting against the alleged persecution of Jews in Germany” could have the unwanted consequence of “do[ing] harm to ecclesiastical cooperation.”⁴ Henry Leiper, his New York counterpart in the Universal Christian Council and author of the Federal Council of Churches statement, responded on March 30, assuring that his “message of warning ” was “gratefully acknowledged,” that concern over “reported German Anti-Semitism” did not reflect “loss of esteem” for Germany, and that the American church attitude remained one of “unbroken trust and friendship.”⁵ Over the next two days Leiper wrote to William Adams Brown, Chairman of the Administrative Committee of the Universal Christian Council and a seasoned European coordinator of the World Alliance, and W.A. Visser’t Hooft, General Secretary of the World’s Student Christian Federation in Geneva, briefing them on the ‘situation’ in Germany. As Leiper understood the looming ecumenical rift -

³ The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work was the primary ecumenical body at the time. A rough genealogy of ecumenical organizations leading to the World Council of Churches begins with The Associated Councils of British and German Empires in 1910), The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches (1914), The World Alliance for Life and Work (1925), The World council of Churches in Formation (1938), The World Council of Churches (1946).

⁴ According to Kapler’s March 27 cable, he followed with letters of the same content to key ecumenical leaders in London and Geneva. See “Telegramm des Herrn Praesidenten Kapler,” March 27, 1933; “Abschrift,” March 30, 1933; “Copies of telegrams received, 31.3.33” (WCC (301.43.18.1); and Letter from Henry Smith Leiper to Dr. Williams Adams Brown, March 31, 1933; (WCC, 301.43.17.1).

⁵ Telegram from Cadman, Cavert, and Leiper to Kapler, March 30, 1933; telegram from Federal Council of Churches to Ohlemueller, Berlin, March 30, 1933; telegram from Cadman to Kapler, March 30, 1933; (WCC, 301.43.18.1)

and as he described it in his letters of March 31 and April 1 - the problem stemmed from a dichotomous interpretation of events, which had given credence to Hitler's widely publicized idea of "a world conspiracy of international Jewry." After German measures against Jews began to be reported in America, Leiper explained, both Jews and Christians had jointly protested and the protests had been interpreted as "simple and unmistakable confirmation of [the Nazi] thesis that Jews had the power to swing whole nations into line." What was now needed in Germany, he advised, was the twofold assurance that 1) there had been no change in the "friendliness of the American people" and, 2) that it was understood that participation "in protests would endanger friendly relations with the German Churches."⁶

Six days later in Germany, April 7, the Law for the Restoration of Professional Civil Services was issued, and on the same day Kapler commissioned an expert opinion on the law from the Central Church Office for Apologetics. On April 11, the day that the First Ordinance of the new law defined 'non-Aryans' according to Jewish lineage, Kaper presented "The Church and the Jewish Question in Germany" at a major church conference in Berlin. According to Klaus Scholder, the points of argument in the position paper hinged on distinctions between state and church aspects of the Jewish question, and both distinctions hinged on the belief that it was not the role of the church to interfere with the state. Unbaptized Jews were to be considered the business of the state, while baptized Jews were to be considered the business of the church. Moreover, the conference agreed that in the case of the 'state problem,' given the unjust discrepancy between Jewish occupancy of public offices and the proportion of Jews in the German population, the state legislation was "an act of harsh but necessary justice," one that "had the character of a protective measure to safeguard the German people." What was at issue here,

⁶ Henry Leiper to William Adams Brown, March 31, and Henry Leiper to W.A. Visser't Hooft, April 1 (WCC, 310.43.17.1).

Scholder says, was not when and how to oppose the legislation against Jews, but how to insist that the state distinguish between Jew and Jewish Christian,, and how to advocate “that elimination of the Jews as a foreign body in the life of the Volk ...not take place in a manner inconsistent with Christian ethos.””⁷

Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s “The Church and the Jewish Question,” penned four days later under the impact of both the Civil Service Law and the church conference, can be seen as an extension of the church opinion paper. Like the former, Bonhoeffer invoked distinctions between state and church, Jews and baptized Jewish Christians, pairing the distinctions so as to highlight a Jewish problem of the state which may not be interfered with by the church, and a Jewish problem of the church which may not be interfered with by the state. In the case of the state, again, “the Jewish question is one of the historical problems which our state must deal with, and, without doubt the state is justified in adopting new methods here.” Bonhoeffer goes on, however, to offer justification for Christian non-interference with the state, by arguing that

the church of Christ has never lost sight...that the ‘chosen people,’ who nailed the redeemer of the world to the cross, must bear the curse for its action through a long history of suffering... When the time comes that this people humbles itself and penitently departs from the sins of its fathers...and calls down upon itself the blood of the Crucified One...that is to be the end of the people’s period of suffering. The Christian church sees th[is] history...as God’s own free and fearful way with his people.

He goes on to say that “this church]consciousness of the curse that bears down upon [Jews] raises it far above any cheap moralizing,” for when the church sees the rejected and suffering Jews, it is reminded of its own unfaithfulness, on the one hand, and of its duty to Jewish Christians “who have [already] come home,” on the other. The church understood, in other words, that God uses

⁷ Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich*, Volume One: *Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions, 1918-1934*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 274-75. This was meant, Scholder says, that elimination of the ‘foreign body’ “should not be achieved by acts of violence.”

the state and other means to penalize Jews, and that until Jews have transferred their allegiance to Christ and church, they remain part of the historical problem for the state. Once that allegiance has been transferred to Jesus and Christianity, however, both the penal suffering of Jews and the responsibility of the state is reversed, and it becomes the duty of the church to “not allow actions towards its members to be prescribed by the state.”⁸

While these grounds for the Christian understanding of Jewish suppression in Germany were being worked out by Germans, ecumenical leadership in Geneva were doing the same in preparation for meetings with leadership of the German church. Henry Louis Henroid, General Secretary of both the World Alliance and the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work, was one of those leaders. After receiving Kapler’s March 27 cable, he began conferring with leaders of ecumenism, collecting pertinent materials, and advising ecumenical organizations to “wait if possible for any public [statement]” until after his upcoming consultations in Germany on April 18 and 19.⁹ Among those materials accompanying this correspondence in the World Council of Churches archives are two position papers compiled by ecumenical colleagues in Geneva, both dated April 13 in advance of Henroid’s trip, which warn against “being lured into the poisoned atmosphere of a propaganda of lies and hatred which threaten international peace and, especially, the friendly relations of the churches. The first, “Facts and Meaning of the German Revolution as Seen from a Neutral Point of View,” is the work of Adolf Keller, President of the Swiss Federation of Protestant Churches and General Secretary of the Life and Work International Christian Social Institute in Geneva, whose colleague, Hans Schoenfeld, was to accompany

⁸ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, “The Church and the Jewish Question,” *No Rusty Swords: Letters, Lectures, and Notes 1928-1936*, Volume 1, *The Collected Works of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, ed. Edwin H Robertson, trans. Edwin H. Robertson and John Bowden (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1967), 223-227.

⁹ Letter to Bishop Ammundsen of Denmark from Henry Louis Henroid, April 11, 1933 (WCC, 301. 43. 17.2).

Henriod to Berlin. Keller was concerned that “public opinion in many countries has been roused ...by the distorted news on atrocities committed against the Jews,” and, in this context, he pointed to “the duty of the Christian conscience to consider an entangled situation in the cold light of real facts before forming hasty judgments.” There was no reason to doubt, he said, “the official declaration of [the German] government and church that with few exceptions no atrocities happened,” or that the boycott was but “an answer to the propaganda of lies in other countries,” or that the attitude of the government toward the Jews is but one aspect of the German revolution. With this, he cautioned that it should be remembered that German “hatred against Jews” was more than a form of race prejudice, it was also a German “charge’ against “the destructive and moral disintegrating influence of the revolutionary Jewish mind.” Considering the degree to which such influence permeates German society, he cautioned, its elimination is “considered a necessary administrative measure.”¹⁰ The second paper, prepared by Wilhelm Visser’t Hooft for publication in *Christian Century*, cautioned in the same vein about journalists, politicians, pacifists, and certain Christian leaders who rush to “judge the recent developments in Germany.” While acknowledging that Jews indeed “have a difficult time in Germany today,” he yet called for distinction between “prejudice and ignorance” and that which is “explicable and to some extent justifiable” reason for German actions against Jews. In terms of that which is both explicable and reasonable, he pointed out that the typical Jewish insistence on “constituting a nation within a nation” would naturally create difficulties for a country “threatened to be torn asunder by disunity and internal division.”¹¹ By way of conclusions to both papers, Keller first and then Visser’t Hooft below, advised that

¹⁰ Adolf Keller, “Facts and Meaning of the German Revolution as Seen from a Neutral Point of View” (WWC, 301.43.17.6).

¹¹ W.A. Visser’t Hooft, untitled draft for *Christian Century* (WCC. 301.43.17.2).

It is therefore wise for sister churches abroad, before taking actions based on insufficient information or a propaganda of hatred, to listen attentively to what the German Church is going to say in order to save her liberty of speech and spiritual life, which is the first condition for taking any action to regard to public affairs.

If the churches mean business [about ecumenical unity and solidarity], they ought now to stand by their German sister-churches and, instead of judging prematurely, inquire into their situation, their difficulties, their fears and hopes.

On April 17, four days after the dating on the position papers, Henroid and Schoenfeld left Geneva for Berlin to hold a series of consultations with German church leadership. Reports of those meetings, along with reports of William Adams Brown's late February and March meetings with church leadership in Berlin and Rengsdorf, informed two assessment papers submitted by Brown near the end of the third week of April. In the first, he concludes that in trying to understand the Nazi attitude toward Jews "it must be remembered that it is a response to real grievances and dangers." The lower standards of morals and character of eastern Jews, the disproportion of Jews in the learned professions, and the increasing size of the Jewish intellectual proletariat are among those grievances, he says, adding that "it is not in Germany only, as we well know, that Jews have abused the privileges granted to them." While careful to qualify that he was not defending "what the Germans have done with reference to the Jews," he yet pointed out that the "main effort of the leaders of the German is to safeguard the independence of the church against the state."¹² In terms of what could be done, he concluded in the second assessment paper, dated April 25 and marked "Confidential," that

public statements by the [German] Church authorities against actions such as the Jewish boycott are out of the question in the present situation. They have their hands full in trying to preserve the Church as an independent unity. The Church people in other countries must simply try to understand that these men are suffering terribly in

¹² Williams Adams Brown, "Impressions of the Situation in Contemporary Germany with Special Reference to its Bearing upon the Future of International Cooperation in the Field of Religion" (WCC, 301.43.17.4).

trying to harmonize their convictions as individual Christians with their responsibility for the church as a whole. Christians in other countries must further realize that public pronouncements are of little value when one is in the midst of a revolutionary process. Such pronouncements are also of no help when they come from foreign countries and are even bound to have the gravest consequences for those whom they are intended to help.¹³

That public statements were out of the question was the same conclusion being drawn by the *Kirchenausschuss* in Berlin on the same day, April 25. The expert opinion paper, “The Church and the Jewish Question in Germany,” was once more presented by President Kapler and the discussion that ensued over the next two days again and again “turned to the difficulties, the possible misunderstandings, and the danger that a declaration [on the Aryan paragraph] could be ‘misused against Germany by foreign powers.’ ” This almost unanimous concern, Scholder reports, led the “great majority” of German Protestant leadership to do as their president had done when he met with Hitler the day before the *Kirchenausschuss* convened: express hope for peace and reconciliation without mentioning the Jewish question.¹⁴

By the end of April 1933 some thirty four days had passed since leaders of the German church had ‘barraged’ the international ecumenical community with cablegrams, urging it to not believe the exaggerated reports coming out of Germany. Yet in that short interval are found the elemental ideas that shaped the course of public statements - or lack of - by both world ecumenism and the German Protestant church over the next nine years.

1. That the German state has cause to implement measures against Jews.
2. That it is not the duty of the German church to interfere with or criticize the state’s handling of the Jewish issue.

¹³ William Adams Brown, “The Situation in Germany” (WCC, 301.43.17.1).

¹⁴ Scholder, 274-279. An extended version of “The Church and the Jewish Question in Germany” was published in the summer of 1933 by the paper’s author, W. Kuenneth, in a volume collection entitled *Die Nation vor Gott*.

3. That it is not in the interest of ecumenical unity to criticize or interfere with the German church.
4. That it is the duty of both the German church and the ecumenical community to express concern about attempts to ‘unbaptize’ Jewish Christians by defining them as Jews.
5. That Jews rest under the penalty of divine punishment until they convert to Christianity.

Whether or not these core ideas can be termed the justifications for a ‘not speaking out’ policy, it is clear from the following study that they informed both groups’ understanding of ‘the situation in Germany’ until roughly the fall of 1942. While the German church remained silent on the treatment of unbaptized Jews, the leadership of world ecumenism continued to criticize the wholesale condemnation of the German people and church, often on grounds that invoked the unjust and ‘immoral’ burdening of Germany for the start of World War I. In a May 15, 1933 report by Walter M. Kotschnig, General Secretary of International Student Service, a branch of Visser’t Hooft’s World’s Student Christian Federation, for example, blaming Germany for the war was said to be “more responsible for the [Nazi] revolution than anything that happened” between 1919 and 1933. The ten-page report, sent to leading ecumenical churchmen in Europe, England, and the United States, placed particular emphasis on the harm of condemning Germany yet again in the present situation, urging that those who did so would bring “the specter of [another] war dangerously near.”¹⁵ Another onsite study in Germany later in the same year had much the same to say about criticizing Germany while urging reasons to withhold judgment. The study was conducted by widely respected Charles S. Macfarland, recent past president of the Federal Council of Churches and active executive in the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work. After consulting with some sixty German Protestant leaders, state officials, and university

¹⁵ Walter M. Kotschnig, “Reflections on a Visit to Germany” (WCC, 301.43.17.7).

theologians in the fall of 1933 - including Ludwig Mueller, Wilhelm Frick, Alfred Rosenberg, former Bishop Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Karl Barth, and Adolf Hitler - Macfarland's report, published in book form in January 1934, included six points that are found again and again in ecumenical documents of the period.

1. That Hitler's "higher motives" correspond with his "deep interest in both Church and people," even if he does not understand the "nature, mind, and spirit of the Christian Church."
2. That the German church "needed unifying and re-inspiration just as the state and people did."
3. That "church and state should cooperate in matters of public welfare."
4. That the German church should not be "threatened with dis-fellowship."
5. That "the New Church of the New Germany" should be given time to find itself.
6. That "we certainly should not become participants in the internal problems of the German Church," but should help by prayers and "sympathetic messages of brotherhood."¹⁶

There was also no perceptible change in the general ecumenical understanding and acceptance of the German church position on the Aryan paragraph. According to a "Private and Confidential" report of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, January 11, 1934 in London,¹⁷ there were no objections to the Aryan paragraph as it applied to unbaptized Jews, for German churchmen had cited "intolerable" Jewish "elements" which "they had determined at all costs to do away with." The 'intolerable elements' cited were derived from a "Strictly Confidential" report by Ruth Rouse, executive member of both the International

¹⁶ Charles W. Macfarland, *The New Church and the New Germany: A Study of Church and State* (NY: Macmillan Company, 1934), 166-177.

¹⁷ "Private and Confidential Report" of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, January 11, 1934 (WCC, 26.12.01.2).

Committee for the Christian Approach to the Jew and the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, whose trip to Germany in late October 1933 included 45 meetings with leaders of the Reich church, confessing church, student organizations, missionary societies, foreign clergy, and Nazi Party members.¹⁸ As the Aryan paragraph applied to baptized Jews, however, it was understood to “cut at the heart of Christianity.” The explanation of S. Parkes Cadman, executive of the Federal Council of Churches, at a July 1935 conference outside London, helps us to grasp the mounting ‘Christian’ significance of the Nazi antiJewish laws to ecumenism.¹⁹

On [April 7, 1933], Germany under National Socialism passed the first of a series of laws creating a chasm between so called Aryans and so-called non-Aryans. The significance of that date for the Christian world lies in the fact that for the first time a government, through its legislation, challenged the validity of baptism.

While Cadman indeed acknowledged in his paper, “Germany’s Christian non-Aryans,” that the effects of that legislation caused the suffering of unbaptized Jews, he held that “the conditions of Jews are essentially more favorable than those of non-Aryan Christians.” Using quotation from a recent issue of the German Protestant periodical *Auf der Warte*, he argued that non-Aryan Christians were faced with a threat above and beyond that of Jews because baptized Jews are “living refutation of the preposterous nonsense about race, religion, and Germanism that is so fiercely promoted by National Socialist leaders.” Here, as elsewhere in the ecumenical archives of the period, are the beginnings of notions that the Christian non-Aryan is a greater threat to Nazis than unbaptized Jews, that “the economic position of the Christian non-Aryan is worse than

¹⁸ ‘Elements’ cited were typical of the period: 1) domination of Jews in certain professions; 2) moral corruption due to Jewish influence and control of cinema and theatre; 3) spread of Communism; 4) sordid influence and economic exploitation of eastern Jews. “Report by Miss Ruth Rouse on Her Visit to Germany,” The Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, October 31, 1933 (WCC, 301.43.17.7).

¹⁹ S. Parkes Cadman, “Germany’s Christian Non-Aryans,” The International Missionary Council’s Committee on the Christian Approach to the Jews, July 10-12 Conference at Old Jordans Hostel, Beaconsfield, Bucks, England (WCC, 26.12.03.2).

that of the Jews,” and that antisemitism is, in actuality, an assault against Christianity. Or, as stated at another ecumenical conference in London on June 11, 1940, “wherever the grisly head of antisemitism is raised the real struggle is about Christianity.”²⁰

In Germany, measures against Jews continued to be viewed in the context of divine punishment. Martin Niemoeller, who was gaining both internal and international reputation as leader of the German Confessing Church and defender of the principles upon which the ‘true’ Christian church was established, delivered a sermon on Jews in August 1935, translated and published in the United States and England in 1937.²¹ The sermon was delivered on the tenth Sunday after Trinity, a day that for centuries had “been dedicated to the Christian memory of the destruction of Jerusalem and the fate of the Jewish people.” The occasion of the commemoration, Niemoeller said, threw “a light on the dark and sinister history of that people who can neither live nor die because it is under a curse that forbids it to do either.” While the invoking of this nineteen hundred year old claim of Jewish guilt for the crucifixion was common, Niemoeller transcended commonplace usage to align the alleged Jewish murder of Christ with the Nazi ideas of “positive Christianity,” the chief characteristic of which was said to be “approv[al] of its messiah just so long as [there was] advantage.” By reducing both Jews and nazified Christianity to the shared intention of ‘gain,’ Niemoeller at one and the same time identified German Christians with Jewish intentions and methods, and Jews with Nazi ideas, adding to the list of ‘crimes’ for which Jews allegedly bore guilt. Indeed, he says that he “cannot help saying quite

²⁰ Report of the United Conference on the Christian Approach to the Jews, London, June 11, 1940 (WCC, 26.12.01.6).

²¹ By early 1934 the German pastorate of approximately seventeen thousand was effectively split into two factions over issues of church autonomy: the Reich Church, headed exclusively by antisemitic and nationalistic German Christians, and the Confessing Church, headed by Martin Niemoeller and others who would lead the reunited German church after the war. Between these approximately equal factions was the remaining third of the pastorate, whose allegiance vacillated back and forth.

harshly and bluntly that the Jewish people came to grief and disgrace because of its positive Christianity.” For this and other crimes, he emphasized no less than three more times that Jews “bear the curse.” They “bear the curse” for the crucifixion, they “bear the curse” for persistent rejection of Christ thereafter, they “bear the curse” for “the blood of all the righteous men who were ever murdered because they testified to the holy will of God against tyrannical human will.”²²

Catholics, too, interpreted Jewish suffering under Nazi suppression as part of the long history of “terrible tribulations [that] must come over Israel.”²³ This was made clear in a document from Vienna in February 1937, issued by an international group referring to themselves as Catholic European Scholars. The work, edited by John Oesterreicher who later emigrated to the United States and became instrumental in the passage of Vatican II’s 1965 *Nostra Aetate*, first appeared in *Die Erfuellung*, a Catholic publication of *Pauluswerk* in Vienna, and was later translated into French, English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Polish. The English translation, on which this reading depends, was published soon after its February 1937 issue by the National Attitudes Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace in Washington, D.C., and included the names of its twenty-four member committee on the cover. The names of fourteen of the original signatories - an impressive list of scholars from Czechoslovakia, Belgium, France, Austria, Switzerland, Holland, Poland, Italy, and France, including Jacques Maritain - appeared at the end. Others who approved the work but for reasons of safety chose to remain

²² Martin Niemoeller, *Here Stand I!*, trans. Jane Lymburn (New York: Willett Clark & Company, 1937), 192-197.

²³ *The Church and the Jews*, English Version by Reverend Dr. Gregory Feige, The Committee on National Attitudes of the Catholic Association for International Peace (New York: Paulist Press, 1937). For names of signers, see Elias H. Fuellenbach, “Shock, Renewal, Crisis: Catholic Reflections on the Shoah,” *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust*, ed. Kevin P. Spicer (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press in association with USHMM, 2007), 201-234.

anonymous included “distinguished Catholics of the clergy and laity” and “noted Catholic political leaders in various countries.”

Such unified approval of this document helps us to understand the pervasiveness of the theology of Jewish suffering even among those with the best of intentions, for the document itself is a vigorous protest against racial antisemitism, Christian non-racial antisemitism (as it was understood), and Nazi legislation against Jews.²⁴ Yet while arguing “to expose...the errors inherent in the practical political side of the contemporary Jewish question,” the authors and approvers nevertheless realize that “God has tried Israel in the past, tries Israel today, and may continue to do so in the future.” The long “unspeakable misery of Israel” did not mean that God “has rejected His people,” as was still held in many Christian quarters, but that the tribulations are God’s plea, and the greater the Jewish opposition to God the “warmer and fiercer His pleading becomes.”

For this reason one may see in the terrible events in Central Europe since 1933 not only a warning of God to [Israel], without, however, trying to condone [events] in the least, but a warning, too, to a Christendom grown indifferent... No one can approach the Jewish question of our day without expressing disappointment and sorrow that, by and large, Judaism did not see in the persecutions of recent years - in harmony with the constant warnings of the prophets - a reason for self-examination and conversion to God and His anointed. Unfortunately most of them see in the happenings since 1933 nothing more than a materialistic, nationalistic self-determination..

Another aspect of the Catholic theology of Jewish suffering stands in bold relief in France some three years later, in the late summer of 1941, under the circumstances of war and Nazi occupation. In correspondence between Leon Berard, French Ambassador to the Vatican,

²⁴ Ibid., Other Christian duties outlined in this well intentioned document include exposing the errors in the racist and antisemitic approach to the Jewish question, “dispel[ing] the prevalent poisonous atmosphere of falsehood and hate,” and denying support to anti-Semitic policies. Like Protestant ecumenism, however, the duty of helping was directed toward “especially and primarily the Christian non-Aryans... To these we are first obliged to show consideration, because they are our brothers and sisters in the spirit and in the faith; it is they who have suffered most of all from the current anti-Jewish legislation in Germany.”

Monsignors Tardini and Montini, officials associated with the Vatican's Secretariat of State, and Marshall Philippe Petain, head of the collaborating Vichy government installed soon after Nazi occupation of France in the summer of 1940, we learn that "from the standpoint of the Holy See," there is no "criticism and disapproval" of Nazi French restrictions against Jews.²⁵ While admitting that the "subject is complex" in a letter to Marshall Petain, Vatican ambassador Berard invoked the teaching of the thirteenth century Doctor of the Church Thomas Aquinas to explain that the "teaching of the Church [against] racial theories does not necessarily mean that it condemns any particular measure of any state against the so-called Jewish race...."

[When] proscribing any policy of oppression towards the Jews, Saint Thomas recommends...[that] measures [be] designed to limit their action in society and to check their influence. [Since] it would be unreasonable, in a Christian state, to permit them to exercise the functions of government and thus to submit Catholics to their authority ... it is legitimate to bar them from public functions, legitimate also to admit but a fixed proportion of them to the universities and to the liberal professions.

As Berard was "told by an authority spokesman at the Vatican, we shall not in the least be reprimanded for this statute on the Jews."²⁶

In keeping with their 'not speaking out' understanding, not a formal word against Jewish atrocities was issued by the corporate voice of Protestant ecumenism until the fall of 1941, even though by May 1938 ecumenical organizations had coalesced into the body that was long-envisioned as a mouthpiece for Christian principles and justice. As to why this newly formed body did not speak out on the "great issues" of the war, Secretary Visser't Hooft said in 1954 that "the prevailing opinion during its period of formation was that the World Council of Churches was not competent to speak in the name of the churches." It was also held, he said, that speaking

²⁵ Helen Fein, *Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 110-113.

²⁶ Leon Berard to Marshall Phillipe Petain, September 2, 1941, Fein, 111-112.

corporately could harm ecumenical unity. Members of the ecumenical body could speak individually but, as directed in a May 20, 1940 letter from Chairman William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, they were to coordinate their messages through Visser't Hooft's Geneva office so that all would be giving the "same message... with a variety of emphases."²⁷

While it is not clear at what point both the stated and unstated tenets upholding corporate silence began to break down, the actual 'speaking out' coincides with the World Council of Churches' awareness of worsening Jewish conditions in French internment camps and the Nazi launching of mass deportations of western European Jews to Poland in October 1941.²⁸ Two letters from Visser't Hooft to the President of the Mixed Relief Committee of the International Red Cross on October 19, 1941 and December 3, 1942 reveal both a growing concern about those being shipped and about the Christian duty attached to such knowledge. Yet, while the October 1941 letter to the Red Cross stresses that it is "the duty of the Christian Churches, and especially their Ecumenical representative... to intervene on behalf of the persecuted," and the December 1942 letter "raises its voice anew on behalf of the people who are being threatened with extermination,"²⁹ it is not until March 22, 1943 that a World Council of Churches statement is issued publicly. Moreover, when Visser't Hooft did "raise" the voice of the WCC to the Red Cross for a second time in early December 1942, the Jewish World Congress had already held a widely reported press conference on November 24 in Washington, D.C. to announce the State

²⁷ W.A. Visser't Hooft, "The Genesis of the World Council of Churches," 697-734, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement: 1517-1948*, ed. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 2004 (1954), 710-711.

²⁸ This statement is based on period documents from the World Council of Churches archives, a March 24, 1965 memorandum by Visser't Hooft, entitled "WCC Action at the time of the extermination of Jewish People" (WCC, 301.43.36.6), and Johan M. Snoek's Protestant apologetic collection, *The Grey Book: A Collection of Protests Against Antisemitism and the Persecution of Jews Issued by Non-Roman Catholic Churches and Church Leaders During Hitler's Rule* (New York: Humanities Press, 1970).

²⁹ W.A. Visser't Hooft, "Memorandum Zur Lage in Polen," October 29, 1941 (WCC, 301.43.31.7). For English translations of both the October 29, 1941 and December 3, 1942 letters, see Snoek, 270-273.

Department's confirmation of two million European Jews already succumbing to Hitler's plan of total extermination.³⁰ Further, it is clear from period archives that throughout August and September 1942 the leadership of the world ecumenical community was inundated with vividly detailed "Confidential" reports of increasing atrocities against Jews from reliable sources in France, Germany, and Poland, yet no statement was forthcoming until March 1943.³¹ Further still, when Visser't Hooft made the public statement on March 22, it was considerably after publicized mass rallies in New York, public statements by multiple organizations, including the allied joint condemnation of Hitler's "policy of cold-blooded extermination" on December 17, 1942, and the insistence of the international press that "it was incumbent upon the Allies to find ways to do more than mourn."³² It was only after receiving a report that 15,000 Jews "including partners of mixed marriages" had been assembled for deportation in Berlin between February 16 and March 2, and some hundreds shot, that Visser't Hooft broke the World Council of Churches non-interfering silence.³³

³⁰ According to Debra Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, the *Christian Century* attack on the World Jewish Congress press release was unprecedented, describing the WJC claims of Jewish deaths as "unpleasantly reminiscent" of the "propaganda triumphs of the First World War," and even calling into question the truth of its claim that the State Department had confirmed the claim, 184-185.

³¹ See Confidential reports on "Present Measures applied to Foreign Jews in non-occupied France" from Donald A. Lowrie on August 10, August 18, September 17, and September 19, 1942, which detail the known plans for mass deportation of 10,000 Jews from France, make clear that the "suffering and panic among Jews in France" is awful, and that "the conditions under which [the actual] action has been carried out, have been revolting." A September report from a "reliable source with close relations to [German] military and industrial circles" details the arrival of trains from Belgium, Holland, and France, and of the use of Jewish corpses in the "manufacture of soap, glue, and train oil." A decoded letter of the same date from Poland describes "the measures of extermination" being applied to Jews in Warsaw." (WCC, 301.43.29.2; 301.43.29.3; 301.43.36.6).

³² See Lipstadt for demands of international press, 190-205.

³³ Undated report describing assembling of Berlin Jews between February 26 and March 2, 1943; March 9, 1943 report rewrite, likely serving as a first draft of the "Aide Memoire;" draft of telegram to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Federal Council of Churches, summarizing the Berlin report, ca. March 8-10, 1943.

This 'speaking out' picture becomes even bleaker when considering the subsequent reaction to Visser't Hooft making his public statement in conjunction with the World Jewish Congress.³⁴ That the "Aide Memoire" was issued in the name of the World Council of Churches without the approval of other board members, and that it singled out "the most urgently acute problem" as the "campaign of deliberate extermination of the Jews in nearly all European countries" was particularly irritating to board member William Paton, who set into motion a round of criticisms, accusing Visser't Hooft (behind his back) of "swallowing the Zionist proposals." In a series of letters to and from Sir Herbert Emerson, High Commissioner for Refugees Under the Protection of the League of Nations, Henry Leiper, Federal Council of Churches, William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chairman of WCC, George Bell, Bishop of Chichester, and others, the regret was widely distributed that "Visser't Hooft should have gone in so definitely with the World Jewish Congress, which is, of course, Zionist." The urging concern of both Paton and Emerson was that "the Jews [had] made a great mistake in speaking only of Jews and in systematically disregarding the fact that a very large number of refugees of all kinds are not Jews at all." Sir Herbert Emerson considered "this attitude of the Jews [to be] a fostering cause of antisemitism."³⁵

What was not known at the time of Visser't Hooft's joint public statement with the World Jewish Congress, or during the subsequent weeks when it was being privately criticized by other WCC officials, is that the tenets that had guided German church silence were also breaking down. In one of the most illuminating (and chilling) church documents to surface after the war, Bishop Theophil Wurm, the most senior bishop of the Confessing Church, penned a letter on January 28,

³⁴ W.A. Visser't Hooft and Gerhard Reigner, "Aide Memoire by the Secretariat of the World Council of Churches and the World Jewish Congress" (WCC, 301.43.31.7).

³⁵ WCC archives, 301.43.31.7.

1943 to a ranking official in the Ministry of the Interior, saying he could no longer remain silent on the “systematic murder of Jews and Poles taking place in the occupied territories.”³⁶

The manner in which the war is being conducted against other races and peoples is causing widespread depression, and not only within the Christian confessions. One learns from holiday-makers to what extent the systematic murder of Jews and Poles is taking place in the occupied territories. Even those of us who... regarded the predominance of Judaism in the various spheres of public life as a grave defect, cannot agree that one people is justified in liquidating another by measures which embrace every single individual irrespective of his personal guilt or innocence. It is contrary to the clear command of God to bring about the death of people who have been convicted or no crime simply because they belong to another race or because their health is not good. It is contrary also to the concepts of justice and humanity without which no cultured people can exist.

Bishop Wurm went on to actually say that “the Evangelical Church has kept silence about this in public to avoid exposing the shame of the German people to foreign eyes.” If, however - and in this he clearly stated a conditional - *if* “the nation is being asked to make further great sacrifices,” *then* “it should [at least] be granted relief from this weight on its conscience.” Wurm’s unease over the weight on the conscience of the nation was expressed again on December 20 in a letter to the Chief of the Reich Chancellery,³⁷ in which he made clear he was writing “not because of any philosemitic sympathies but solely from religious and ethical considerations.”

I must declare, in accordance with the opinion of all [true] Christian circles in Germany, that we as Christians consider the policy of annihilation of the Jews as a terrible injustice, fatal to the German people... [one that] will recoil sooner or later on its perpetrators. Our people in many respects is [already] experiencing sufferings which it has to bear from the air-attacks of the enemy, as if in retribution for what was inflicted upon the Jews...

³⁶ Theophil Wurm, Letter to Ministerial Director Dr. Dill, Ministry of Interior, January 28, 1943, Peter Mathesen, ed., *The Third Reich and the Christian Churches: A Documentary Account of Christian Resistance and Complicity During the Nazi Era* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981), 97-98.

³⁷ Theophil Wurm, Letter to Dr. Lammers, Chief of the Reich Chancellery, December 20, 1943; Snoek, 112-113.

Bishop Wurm's concern remained the same as in his first letter. Not only were "such goings on" distressing, "causing widespread depression," they were looked upon as "involving us all in a guilt for which there may be bitter revenge."³⁸

³⁸ Theophil Wurm to Dill, January 28, 1943, Mathesen, 97-98.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Source Collections

Ayer, Joseph Cullen, Jr. *A Source Book for Ancient Church History: From the Apostolic Age to the Close of the Conciliar Period*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939).

Bettenson, Henry, Ed. *Documents of the Christian Church*, Second Edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Brockway, Allan, and Paul van Buren, Rolf Rendtorff, Simon Schoon. *The Theology of the Churches and the Jewish People: Statements by the World Council of Churches and its Member Churches*. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1988.

Burns, J. Patout, Ed. and Trans. *Theological Anthropology*, Sources of Early Christian Thought Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).

Coxe, Cleveland A. *The Ante-Nicen Fathers: Translations of the Fathers down to AD325*, Revised. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Erdmans, 1956.

Croner, Helga, ed. *Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Christian Relations: An Unabridged Collection of Christian Documents*. London and New York: Stimulus Books, 1977.

Denzinger, Heinrich, Ed. *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, 30th edition, translated by Roy J. Deferrari. New Hampshire: Loreto Publications, 2001.

Grayzel, Solomon, Ed. and trans. *The Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, Revised Edition. New York: Hermon Press, 1966.

Grayzel, Solomon, Trans. and Kenneth R. Stow, Ed. *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, Volume II. New York and Detroit: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America and Wayne State University Press, 1989.

Hefele, Karl Joseph. *A History of the Christian Councils, From the Original Documents*, trans. William R. Clark, 5 volumes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1972.

Hentschel, Klaus, Ed. *Physics and National Socialism, An Anthology of Primary Sources*. Ann. M. Hentschel, trans. Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhaeuser Verlag, 1996.

Ihm, Claudia Carlen, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1981*. Pierian Press, 1990. *The Papal Encyclicals Online*, www.papalencyclicals.net.

Lake, Kirsopp, Trans. *The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Heinemann, 1912-1913.

- Levy, Richard. S., Ed. *Antisemitism in the Modern World*. Toronto: D. C. Heath & Company, 1991.
- Linder, Amnon, Ed. and Trans. *The Jews in the Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages*. Jerusalem and Detroit: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and Wayne State University Press, 1997.
- _____. *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*. .Detroit and Jerusalem: Wayne State University Press and the Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1987.
- Marcus, Jacob Rader, Ed. *The Jew in the Medieval World, A Source Book: 315-1791*, Revised Edition, with Introduction by Marc Saperstein. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1999.
- Mendelsohn, John, Ed. *The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982.
- Mendes-Flohr, Paul R. and Jehuda Reinharz, Ed. *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Peters, Edward, Ed. *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Material*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1972.
- Pharr, Clyde, Ed. and Trans. *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions: A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Quasten, Johannes and Joseph C. Plumpe, Ed. *Ancient Christian Writer: The Works of the Fathers in Translation*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1946-1989.
- Rendtorff, Rolf and Hans Hermann Hendrix, Eds. *Die Kirchen und das Judentum: Dokumente von 1945 bis 1968*. Munchen: Verlag Bonifatius-Druckerei paderborn und Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1989.
- Richardson, Cyril C., Eugene R. Fairweather, Edward Rochie Hardy, Massey Hamilton Shepherd. *Early Christian Fathers*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1970.
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson, Ed. *Ante Nicene Fathers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1885.
- Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace, Ed. *Nicene and Post- Nicene Fathers*, First and Second Series. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1890.
- Schrekenberg, Heinz. *Die Christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte Und Ihr Literarisches Und Historisches Umfeld*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Simonsohn, Shlomo, Ed. and Trans. *The Apostolic See and the Jews: Documents, 492-1404*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988.

Snoek, Johann M. *The Grey Book: A Collection of Protests Against Anti-Semitism and the Persecution of Jews Issued by Non-Roman Catholic Churches and Church Leaders During Hitler's Rule*. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.

Stern, Menahen, Ed. and Trans. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (3 vols). Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976-1982.

Tanner, Norman J., Ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Volumes I and II. London and Georgetown: Sheed & Ward Limited and Georgetown University Press, 1990.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *The Bible, the Jews, and the Death of Jesus: A Collection of Catholic Documents*. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004.

World Council of Churches Archives. Geneva, Switzerland.

Primary Sources

Albl, Martin C., Ed. and Trans. *Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa: Testimonies Against the Jews*. Atlanta & Leiden: Society of Biblical Literature and Brill, 2004.

Barth, Karl. *Against the Stream: Shorter Post-War Writings, 1946-1952*. New York: SCM Press, 1954.

Bea, Augustin Cardinal. *The Church and the Jewish People: A Commentary on the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on the Relation of the Church to the Non-Christian Religions*, translated by Philip Loretz. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

Black, James. *The Validity of the Christian Approach to the Jews*. New York and London: International Missionary Council, 1931.

_____. *The Christian Approach to the Jew: A Report on the Conferences Held at Budapest and Warsaw in April 1927*. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1927.

Boegner, Marc. *The Long Road to Unity: Memories and Anticipations*, translated by Rene Hague, Introduction by W.A. Visser 't Hooft. London: Collins, 1970.

Boulding, Maria, Ed. and Trans. *Exposition of the Psalms, The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, Introduction by Michael Fieldrowicz. New York: New York City Press, 1990.

Dywon, R.W., ed and trans. *Aquinas, Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. J

Ellis, W. Ashton, Ed. *Richard Wagner's Prose Work*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1897.

Feige, Gregory, Trans. *The Church and the Jews: A Memorial Issued by Catholic European*

- Scholars*. Washington and New York: Catholic Association for International Peace and Paulist Press, 1937.
- Gui, Bernard. *Practica Inquisitionis Hereticae Pravitatis*, Trans. and Ed., Janet Shirley. UK: Ravenhall Books, 2006.
- Hedenquist, Goete, Ed. *The Church and the Jewish People*. London: Edinburgh House, 1954.
- Hoffman, Conrad. *The Jews Today: A Call to Christian Action*. New York: International Missionary Council, 1941.
- _____. Ed. *Jews and Christians: A New Approach to an Old Problem*. New York and London: International Missionary Council, 1933.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*, translated by Ralph Manheim, Introduction by Konrad Heiden. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.
- International Missionary Council. *Christians and Jews: A Report of the Conference on the Christian Approach to the Jews, Atlantic City, New Jersey, May 12-15, 1931*. New York and London, 1931.
- James, Bruno Scott, Ed and Trans. *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*. Cistercian Publications, 1998.
- Lazare, Bernard. *Antisemitism, Its History and Cause*. London: Britons Publishing Company, 1967.
- Moehlman, Conrad Henry. *The Christian-Jewish Tragedy: A Study in Religious Prejudice*. Rochester: The Printing House of Leo Hart, 1933.
- Morawski, Michal. *The Position of the Church on the Jewish Danger*. Wloclawek, Poland, 1938.
- Oesterreicher, John M. *The New Encounter: Between Christians and Jews*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1985.
- _____. *Anatomy of Contempt: A Critique of R.R.Reuther's 'Faith and Fratricide'*. New Jersey: Seton Hall Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies, 1975.
- O'Malley, Joseph, Ed. and Trans. *Marx: Early Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Oppenheim, Bodhan W., Ed. *The Polish Catholic Church and the Struggle Against Anti-Semitism: An Exchange of American and Polish Experiences*. Chicago and Cracow: Cardinal Bernardin Center and Judaica Foundation Center for Jewish Culture, 2001.
- _____. Ed. *Examination of Conscience: the Polish Church Confronts Anti-Semitism, 1989-1999, Conference Proceedings*. Los Angeles: Mimeograph, 1991.

Osborne, Charles, Ed. *Richard Wagner: Stories and Essays*. New York: The Library Press, 1973.

Robertson, Edwin H., Ed. *No Rusty Swords: Letters, Lectures and Notes, 1928-1936, From the Collected Works of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, Volume I, trans. Edwin H. Robertson and John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row,

Schmidt, Stjepan, Ed. *Augustine Cardinal Bea, Spiritual Profile: Notes from the Cardinal's Diary with a Commentary*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.

Sherman, Franklin, Ed.. *Luther's Works*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1974.

Stepelevich, Lawrence S. Bauer, Ed. *The Young Hegelians: An Anthology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Stone, Michael E. and Roberta R. Ervine, Ed. and Trans. *The Armenian Texts of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Louvain: Peeters, 2000.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Pope John Paul II on Jews and Judaism, 1979-1986*, edited by Eugene J. Fisher and Leon Klenicki. Washington, D.C.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Catholic Teaching on the Shoah: Implementing the Holy See's We Remember*. Washington, D.C., 2001.

— *Catholics Remember the Holocaust*. Washington, D.C., 1998).

Visser't hooft, W.A. *Memoirs*. Geneva: World Council of Churches Publications, 1973.

Voltaire. *Political Writings*, .Ed. and Trans., David Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

World Council of Churches. *The New Delhi Report: The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 1961*. New York: Association Press, 1962.

Secondary Sources

Abert, Bat-sheva. "Isidore of Seville: His Attitude Towards Judaism and His Impace on Early Medieval Canon Law," *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, Vol.80. No.3/4 (Jan.-Apr. 1990), 207-220.

Arad, Yitshak. "The Christian Churches and the Persecution of Jews in the Occupied Territories of the USSR," 401-411, *Judaism and Christianity Under the Impact of National Socialism*. Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel, 1987.

Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, Revised. New York: Penguin Books, 1963.

— *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979.

Ariel, Yaakov. *Evangelizing the Chosen People: Missions to Jews in America*, 2000.

___ "Jewish Suffering and Christian Salvation: The Evangelical-Fundamentalist Holocaust Memoirs," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Vol.6, No.1, 1991.

Aschheim, Steven E. *Culture and Catastrophe: German and Jewish Confrontations with National Socialism and Other Crises* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).

___ "The Jew Within:" The Myth of 'Judaization' in Germany," *The Jewish Response to German Culture*, Edited by Jehuda Reinharz and Walter Schatzberg. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1985.

Bacharach, Walter Zui. *Anti-Jewish Prejudices in German-Catholic Sermons*, Trans., Chaya Galai, 1993.

Barnett, Victoria. *Bystanders: Conscience and Complicity during the Holocaust*. Greenwood Press, 1999.

___ *For the Soul of the People: Protestant Protest Against Hitler*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Baron, Salo. "John Calvin and the Jews," *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: from Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, edited by Jeremy Cohen. NY and London: New York University Press, 1991.

Barrett, C.K. "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, Eds. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Sorogy. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976.

Bauer, Yehuda. *Rethinking the Holocaust*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001.

___ *A History of the Holocaust*. New York: Franklin Watts, 1982.

Baum, Gregory. *The Jews and the Gospel: A Re-Examination of the New Testament*. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1961.

Baur, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Bein, Alex. *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*, translated by Harry Zohn (New York: Herzl Press, 1990).

___ "The Jewish Parasite: Notes on the Semantics of the Jewish Problem, with Special Reference to Germany," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, IX, 1964.

Bergen, Doris L. *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

___ "Religion and the Holocaust," *Lessons and Legacies IV*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2003.

Bishop, Claire Huchet. *How Catholics Look at Jews: Inquiries into Italian, Spanish, and French Teaching Materials*. New York: Paulist Press, 1974.

Blobaum, Robert, editor. *Antisemitism and Its Opponents in Modern Poland*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Blowers, Paul M., Ed. and Trans.. *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity*, Ed., C. Mondesert. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.

Blumenkranz, B. "The Roman Church and the Jews," *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict, from Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, Jeremy Cohen, Ed. New York & London: New York University Press, 1991.

Boyens, Armin. "The World Council of Churches and Its Activities on behalf of the Jews in the Nazi Period," 453-469, *Judaism and Christianity Under National Socialism*. Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel, 1987.

___ "The Ecumenical Community and the Holocaust," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol.450 (Jul.1980, 140-152.

Boyer, John W. *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Boys-Stone, G.R. *Post Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of its Development from the Stoics to Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Brown, Charles Thomas. *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000..

Braham, Randolph L., Ed. *The Vatican and the Holocaust: The Catholic Church and the Jews During the Nazi Era*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

___Ed. *The Origins of the Holocaust: Christian Anti-Semitism*. New York: Social Science Monographs and Institute for Holocaust Studies of the City University of New York, 1986.

___*The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary*, Volume 1 and 2. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Braybrooke, Marcus. *Children of One God: A History of the Council of Christians and Jews* London: Mitchell, 1991.

Brockway, Allan. *For Love of the Jews*. (Dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1992).

Brown-Flemming, Suzanne. *The Holocaust and Catholic Conscience: Cardinal Aloisius Muench and the Guilt Question in Germany* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2006.

Browning, Christopher. *Ordinary Men*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.

Broszat, Martin. *German National Socialism: 1919-1945*, translated by Kurt Rosenbaum and Inge Pauli Boehm. California: Clio Press, 1960).

Brown, Charles Thomas. *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Brown-Fleming, Suzanne. *The Holocaust and Catholic Conscience: Cardinal Aloisius Muench and the Guilt Questions in Germany*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

— "Recent Historiographical Contributions to the History of the Churches and the Holocaust: The Catholic Case," *Lessons and Legacies VII: The Holocaust in International Perspective*, ed. with Introduction, Dagmar Herzog (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2006).

Brustein, William I. *Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Buren, Paul van. "Changes in Christian Theology," 285-293, *The Holocaust: Ideology, Bureaucracy, and Genocide*, ed. Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton. Millwood, New York: Kraus International Publications, 1980.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007..

Carroll, James. *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2001.

Chazan, Robert. "Medieval Anti-Semitism," *History and Hate: The Dimensions of Antisemitism*, David Berger, Ed. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1986.

Cline, Catherine Ann. "Ecumenism and Appeasement: The Bishops of the Church of England and the Treaty of Versailles," *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol.61, No.4 (Dec.1989), 693-703.

Cohen, Arthur. "The Holocaust and Christian Theology: An Interpretation of the Problem," *Judaism and Christianity Under National Socialism*. Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel, 1987.

Cohen, Jeremy. *Christ Killers: The Jews and the Passion, From the Bible to the Big Screen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

— *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

— *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism*. Ithica and London: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Cohen, Richard I. "Jews and Christians in France during World War II: A Methodological Essay," *JCUNS*, 1987, 327-340. Xerox

Cohen, Shaye J.D. " 'Anti-Semitism' in Antiquity: The Problem of Definition," 43-47, *History and Hate: The Dimensions of Anti-Semitism*, Ed. David Berger. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1986.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, 2nd edition. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

William Combs. *The Voice of the SS: A History of the SS Journal 'Das Schwarze Korps.'* New York, Berne, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1986.

Conway, J. S. "How Shall the Nations Repent? The Stuttgart Declaration of Guilt, October 1945," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol.38, No.4 (October 1987), 596-622.

___ "Catholicism and the Jews During the Nazi Period and After," 435-452, *Judaism and Christianity Under the Impact of National Socialism*, ed. Otto Dov Kulka and Paul R. Mendes-Flohr. Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel and the Salman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1987.

___ "The Political Theology of Martin Niemöller," *German Studies Review*, Vol.9, No.3 (Oct.1986), 521-546.

___ "Protestant Missions to the Jews, 1810-1980: Ecclesiastical Imperialism or Theological Aberration," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, I:1 (1986), 127-146.

___ *The Nazi Persecution of the Churches: 1933-45*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era*, translated by M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Crossan, John Dominic. *Who Killed Jesus: Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1995.

Davies, Alan, Ed. *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

Dawidowicz, Lucy. *The War Against the Jews*. New York: Bantam Books, 1975.

Dietrich, Donald J. "Catholic Theology and the Challenge of Nazism," 76-101, *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust*, Kevin Spicer, Ed. Indiana University Press, 2007.

Douglas, Paul F. *God Among the German*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935.

Drews, Wolfram. *The Unknown Neighbour: The Jew in the Thought of Isidore of Seville*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.

Drinan, Robert F. "The Christian Response to the Holocaust," *Annals of the American Academy*

- of Political and Social Science*, Vol.450 (Jul.1980), 179-189.
- Dundes, Alan, Editor. *The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic Folklore*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. *Tertullian*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2004.
- Deusen, Nancy Van, Ed. *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Eckardt, A. Roy. *Elder and Younger Brothers: The Encounter of Jews and Christians*. New York, 1973.
- Emery, Richard Wilder. *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.
- Ericksen, Robert P. *Theologians Under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus, and Emanuel Hirsch*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Ericksen, Robert P. and Susannah Heschel. "The German Churches Face Hitler: Assessment of the Historiography," *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch fuer deutsche Geschichte* XXIII/1994, 433-459.
- Ettinger, Shmuel. "The Secular Roots of Modern Antisemitism," 37-61, *Judaism and Christianity Under National Socialism*. Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A., Donald A. Hagner, ed. *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith*. Minneapolis: Fortress press, 1993.
- Evans, G.R. *The Thought of Gregory the Great*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- *Augustine on Evil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Everett, Robert A. *Christianity Without Antisemitism: James Parkes and the Jewish-Christian Encounter*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press, 1993.
- Falk, Gerhard. *The Jew in Christian Theology, including Martin Luther's Anti-Jewish Vom Schem Hamphoras, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1992.
- Fein, Helen. *Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979..
- Feldman, Louis H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Flannery, Edward H. *The Anguish of the Jews: A Catholic Priest Writes of 23 Centuries of Anti-Semitism*. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1965.

- Fleischner, Eva. *Judaism in German Christian Theology Since 1945: Christianity and Israel Considered in Terms of Mission*. New Jersey: Metuchen, 1975.
- Frend, W.H.C. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1965.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Moses and Monotheism*, translated by Katherine Jones. New York: Vintage Books, 1939.
- Friedlaender, Saul. *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, Vol.I, *The Years of Persecution*. New York: Harper Collins, 1997.
- Friedman, Jerome. "Jewish Conversion, the Spanish Pure Blood Laws, and Reformation: A Revisionist View of Racial and Religious Antisemitism," *Sixth Century Journal*, Vol.18, No.1 (Spring 1987), 3-30.
- Friedman, Saul S. *The Oberammergau Passion Play: A Lance against Civilization*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.
- Frøehlich, Karlfried. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Fuellenbach, Elias H. "Shock, Renewal, Crisis: Catholic Reflections on the Shoah," *The Holocaust, Christianity, Christian Ambivalence*, Kevin Spicer, Ed. Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Funkenstein, Amos. "Theological Interpretation of the Holocaust," 275-303, *Unanswered Questions: Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews*, Francois Furet, Ed. New York: Schocken Books, 1989.
- Gager, John. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Towards Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Geehr, Richard S, editor. *I Decide Who is a Jew: The Papers of Dr. Karl Leuger*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982.
- Gelber, Mark H. "What is Literary Antisemitism?" *Jewish Social Studies*, Volume XLVII, Winter 1985, No.1; pp. 1-20.
- Gerdmar, Anders. *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, From Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Gerlach, Wolfgang. *And the Witnesses Were Silent: The Confessing Church and the Persecution of the Jews*, Trans. Victoria Barnett. Lincoln: University of nebraska press, 2000..
- Gervers, Michael. *The Second Crusade and the Cistercian*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

- Giddings, Robert. "Wagner and the Revolutionaries," *Music & Letters*, Vol.45, No.4 (Oct.1964), 348-358.
- Gidney, W.T. *The London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews*. London, 1903.
- Gilbert, Martin. *Atlas of the Holocaust*. New York: William Morrow, 1988.
- Given, James B. *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc*. Ithica and London: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stark. *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism: A Scientific Study of the Ways in which the Teachings of Christian Churches Shape American Attitudes Toward the Jew*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Gold, Judith Taylor. *Monsters and Madonnas: The Roots of Christian Anti-Semitism*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.
- Goldhagen, Daniel Johan. *A Moral Reckoning: The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.
- _____. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.
- Grieve, Hermann. "Between Christian Anti-Judaism and National Socialist Antisemitism: The Case of German Catholicism," *Judaism and Christianity Under the Impact Of National Socialism*. Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel and The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1987.
- Gutteridge, Richard. *Open Thy Mouth for the Dumb: The German Evangelical Church and the Jews, 1879-1950*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976.
- Haas, Peter J. *Morality After Auschwitz*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Haynes, Stephen R. *The Bonhoeffer Legacy: Post Holocaust Perspectives*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- _____. *Reluctant Witnesses: Jews and the Christian Imagination*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Helmreich, Ernst Christian. *The German Churches Under Hitler*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979.
- Herczl, Moshe Y. *Christianity and the Holocaust of Hungarian Jewry*, Tans., Joel Lerner. New York: New York University Press, 1993.
- Heschel, Susannah. *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

—“Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life,” *Church History*, Vol.63, No.4 (Dec.1994), 587-605.

Hilberg, Raul. *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Third Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Hockenos, Matthew D. *A Church Divided: German Protestants Confront the Nazi Past*. Indiana University Press, 2004.

—“The German Protestant Church and its *Judenmission*, 1945-1950,” 173-200, *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust*, ed. Kevin P. Spicer. Indiana University Press, 2007.

Holc, Janine P. “Memory Contested: Jewish and Catholic Views of Auschwitz in Present Day Poland,” 301-325, *Antisemitism and Its Opponents in Modern Poland*, edited by Robert Blobaum. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Holtschneider, Hannah K. *German Protestants Remember the Holocaust*. Muenster: Lit Verlag, 2001.

Hundert, Gerson David. *Jews in Poland-Lithuania in the Eighteenth century: A Genealogy of Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Isaac, Jules. *Jesus and Israel: A Call for the Necessary Correction of Christian Teaching on the Jews*, translated by Sally Gran, edited and Forward by Claire Huchet Bishop. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

—*The Teaching of Contempt: Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism*, translated by Helen Weaver. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paidea*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

Johnson, Luke T. “The New Testament’s Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 108. No. 3 (Fall 1989), 419-441.

Kampe, Norbert. “Jews and Antisemites at Universities in Imperial Germany, The Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universitaet of Berlin: A Case Study on the Students’ ‘Jewish Question,’ ” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXXII*, 1987, 43-101.

Katz, Jacob. *The Darker Side of Genius: Richard Wagner's Anti-Semitism*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1986.

Katz, Steven T. *The Holocaust in Historical Context, Volume I: The Holocaust and Mass Death Before the Modern Age*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Kertzer, David I. *The Popes Against the Jews: The Vatican’s Role in the Rise of Modern Anti-Semitism*. New York: Vintage, Random House, Inc., 2002.

- Klein, Charlotte. *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Koonz, Claudia. *The Nazi Conscience*. Cambridge, Mass and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Kulka, Otto Dov. "Popular Christian Attitudes in the Third Reich to National Socialist Policies Towards the Jews," 251-267, *Judaism and Christianity Under the Impact of National Socialism*. Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel, 1987.
- Lamarch, Paul. "The Septuagint Bible of the Earliest Christians," *The Bible in Christian Antiquity*, Ed. and Trans., Paul M. Blowers. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- Lang, Berel. *Act and Idea in the Nazi Genocide*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Lang, Clarence R. "Imposed German Guilt: The Stuttgart Declaration of 1945," *Institute for Historical Review*, Spring 1988, Vol.3, 55-78. (www.ijr.org.jhr/v08/v09p-55_Lang.html.)
- Langmuir, Gavin I. *Towards A Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- ___ *History, Religion and Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Lawson, Tom. "Shaping the Holocaust: The Influence of Christian Discourse on Perceptions of the European Jewish Tragedy," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Volume 21, Number 3 (Winter 2007), 404-420.
- ___ *The Church of England and the Holocaust: Christianity, Memory and Nazism*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2006.
- ___ "The Anglican Understanding of Nazism 1933-1945: Placing the Church of England's Response to the Holocaust in Context, *Twentieth Century British History*, Vol.14, No.2 (2003), 112-137.
- Lewis, Bernard. *Semites and Anti-Semites: An Inquiry Into Conflict and Prejudice*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1986. .
- Lewy, Guenter. *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany*. Cambridge and New York: Da Capo Press, 2000.
- Libionka, Dariusz. "Antisemitism, Anti-Judaism, and the Polish Catholic Clergy during the Second World War, 1939-1945," 233-264, *Antisemitism and Its Opponents in Modern Poland*, edited by Robert Blobaum. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Lichtheim, George. *Europe in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

- Lieu, Judith. "History and Theology In Christian Views of Judaism." *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians In The Roman Empire*, Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak, eds. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Lipton, Sarah. *Images of Intolerance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- Littell, Franklin. *The Crucifixion of the Jews: The Failure of Christians to Understand the Jewish Experience*. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Matthaeus, Juergen. "Anti-Semitism as an Offer: The Function of Ideological Indoctrination in the SS and Police Corps During the Holocaust," *Lessons and Legacies VII*, ed. and Introduction, Dagmar Herzog. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007, 116-128.
- Meeks, Wayne and Robert Wilken. *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*. Missoula, Montana, 1978.
- Michael, Robert. *A History of Catholic Antisemitism: The Dark Side of the Church*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
- _____. *Holy Hatred: Christianity, Antisemitism, and the Holocaust*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- _____. "Christian Antisemitism and Richard Wagner: A Reexamination," *Patterns of Prejudice* (December 1991-January 1992).
- _____. "Theologia Glorae and Civilitas Cattolica's Attitudes Toward the Jews of the Holocaust," *Encounter*, Vol. 50, No. 2 Spring 1989, 151-66.
- _____. "Theological Myth, German Antisemitism, and the Holocaust: The Case of Niemöller," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Vol.2 No. 1 (1987).
- _____. "Luther, Luther Scholars, and the Jews," *Encounter* (Fall 1985), 339-56
- Michlic, Joanna Beata. *Poland's Threatening Other: The Image of the Jew from 1880 to the Present*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006.
- _____. "'The Open Church' and 'the Closed Church' and the Discourse on Jews in Poland Between 1989 and 2000," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 37 (2004), 461-479.
- Modras, Ronald. *The Catholic Church and Antisemitism: Poland, 1933-1939*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Mommsen, Hans. "The Realization of the Unthinkable: the 'Final Solution of the Jewish Question' in the Third Reich," 97-144, *The Policies of Genocide: Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany*, E. Gerhard Hirschfeld, Ed. London: Allen & Unwin, 1986.
- Moore, R.I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Ltd. 1987.

- Morais, Vambretto. *A Short History of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Norton & Company, 1976.
- Mosse, George L. *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural, and Social Life in The Third Reich*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1966.
- Nelson, Burton F. "1934: Pivotal Year of the Church Struggle," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 4.3 (1989), 283-297.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Aphrahat and Judaism: The Christian-Jewish Argument in Fourth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Newman, Louis Israel. *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements*.
- Nicholls, William. *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate*. Northvale, New Jersey and London: Jason Aronson, Inc. 1995.
- Niewyk, Donald L. "Solving the 'Jewish Problem': Continuity and Change in German Antisemitism, 1871-1945," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXXV*, 1990, 335-370.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Age of Renaissance and Reformation*, Trans., James I. Porter. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Olsen, Bernhard E. *Faith and Prejudice: Intergroup Problems in Protestant Curricula*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963)
- Papan, Patricia von. 'Scholarly' Antisemitism during the Third Reich: The Reichsinstitut's Research on the 'Jewish Question,' 1935-1945." (Columbia University Dissertation, 1999).
- Parkes, James W. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism*. Jewish Publication Society, 1934; New York: Atheneum, 1969, 1974, 1977.
- ___ *The Jew and His Neighbor: A Study of the Causes of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931.
- Passelecq, Georges and Bernard Suchecky. *The Hidden Encyclical of Pius XI*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1997.
- Pawlikowski, John. "Religion as Hatred: Antisemitism as a Case Study," *Journal of Hate Studies* (Dec. 2004).
- ___ "Christian Anti-Semitism: Past History, Present Challenges, Reflections in Light of Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ*," *Journal of Religion and Film* Vol.8 Special Issue No.1 (Feb.2004).
- ___ *When Catholics Speak About Jews: Notes for Homilists and Catechists*. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publication, 1987.

- Pegg, Mark Gergory. *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Prayer, Michael. *The Catholic Church and the Holocaust, 1930-1965*. Indiana University Press, 2001.
- Poliakov, Leon. *The History of Anti-Semitism*, Vol. I-IV. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Porter, Brian. "Antisemitism and the Search for a Catholic Identity," 103-123, *Antisemitism and Its Opponents in Modern Poland*, edited by Robert Blobaum. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Pulzer, P.G.J. *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany And Austria*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Rajak, Tessa. "The Jewish Community and its Boundaries," *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, Ed., Judith Lieu, John North, and Tessa Rajak. London: Routledge Press, 1992.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. "Religion and Politics in Germany since 1945: The Evangelical and Catholic Churches," *Journal of Church and State*, Winter 2000, 42.1, 115-145
- Reichmann, Eva G. *Hostages of Civilization: The Social Sources of National Socialist Antisemitism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1951.
- Reppen, Konrad. "German Catholicism and the Jews: 1933-1945," *JCUNS*, 1987, 197-226.
- Reuther, Rosemary Radford. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. Minneapolis: Seabury Press, 1974.
- Reurup, Reinhard. "The European Revolutions of 1848 and Jewish Emancipation," 1-53, *Revolution and Evolution: 1848 in German-Jewish History*, Werner E. Mosse, Arnold Paucker, Reinhard Ruerup, Ed. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1981.
- Riegner, Gerhart M. *Never Despair: Sixty Years in the Service of the Jewish People and the Cause of Human Rights*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2006.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews*.
- Rittner, Carol, and Stephen D. Smith, Irena Steinfeldt. *The Holocaust and the Christian World: Reflections on the Past, Challenges for the Future*, Yehuda Bauer, consulting ed. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Rose, Paul Lawrence. *Wagner: Race and Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- _____. *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

- ___ *Bodin and the Great God of Nature: The Moral and Religious Universe of a Judaizer*. Geneva, 1980.
- Rosenberg, Alan and Gerald E. Myers, Ed. *Echoes from the Holocaust: Philosophical Reflections on a Dark Time*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988.
- Rosenbloom, Joseph R. *Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present*. Jersey City: Ktav Publishers, Inc., 197).
- Ross, Robert. "Perverse Witness to the Holocaust: Christian Missions and Missionaries," *Holocaust Studies Annual II*, 126-139. Greenwood, Florida: Penkevill Publishing Co., 1986.
- Rotenstreich, Nathan. *Jews and German Philosophy*. New York: Schocken Books, 1984.
- ___ "For and against Emancipation: The Bruno Bauer Controversy," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book IV* (1959), 3-36.
- Roth, John K. "Science and the Determination of the Good: Critique," 81-85, *Ethics After the Holocaust*, ed. John K Roth. St. Paul: Paragon House, 1999.
- Roth, John K. and Michael Berenbaum. *Holocaust: Religious and Philosophical Implications*. New York: Paragon House, 1989.
- Rouse, Ruth and Stephen Charles Neill. *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, Volume 1: 1517-1948*. Geneva: World Council of Churches Publications, 1954.
- Royal, Robert, Ed.. *Jacques Maritain and the Jews*. Notre Dame: American Maritain Association, 1994.
- Rubenstein, Richard. *When Jesus Became God: The Struggle to Define Christianity During the Last Days of Rome*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999.
- Rubenstein, Richard L. and John K. Roth. *Approaches to Auschwitz: The Holocaust and Its Legacy*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987.
- Rubenstein, Richard L. *After Auschwitz: History, Theology, and Contemporary Judaism*, 2nd Edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Rubin, Miri. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Runia, David T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature, Vol.III Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Sec.III, Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literatur*. The Netherlands and Minneapolis: Van Corcum & Comp B.V. and Fortress Press, 1993.
- Sadowski, Konrad. "Clerical Nationalism and Antisemitism: Catholic priests, Jews, and Orthodox Christians in the Lublin Region, 1918-1939," 171-188, *Antisemitism and Its*

- Opponents in Modern Poland*, edited by Robert Blobaum. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Schaefer, Peter. *Judeophobia: Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Schleunes, Karl A., Ed. and Introduction. *Legislating the Holocaust: The Bernhard Loesener Memoirs and Supporting Documents*, Translated by Carol Scherer. Boulder & Oxford: Westview Press, 2001
- *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1939*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1970 and 1991.
- Scholder, Klaus. *The Churches and the Third Reich, Volume One: Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions, 1918-1934*, Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Schorsch, Ismar. "German Antisemitism in the Light of Post-War Historiography," *Leo Bach Institute Year Book XIX*, 1974, 257-271.
- Schrekenberg, Heinz. *The Jews in Christian Art: An Illustrated History*. New York: Continuum, 1996.
- Seaver, James. *The Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire*. (Cornell University, Dissertation, 1946).
- Shapiro, James. *Oberammergau: The Troubling Story of the World's Most Famous Passion Play*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2000.
- Shepherdson, Christine. *Anti-Judaism and Christian Orthodoxy: Ephrem's Hymns in Fourth-Century Syria*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008.
- Simon, Marcel. *Versus Israel: A Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, AD 135-425*, Trans., H. Mckeating. London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1996.
- Spicer, Kevin P. "Father Wilhelm Senn and the Legacy of Brown Priests, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Volume 22, Number 2 (Fall 2008), 293-319.
- "Working for the Fuehrer," *Antisemitism, 105-120, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust*, ed. Kevin P. Spicer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Stark, Rodney, and Bruce D. Foster, Charles Y. Glock, Harold E. Quinley. *Wayward Shepherds: Prejudice & the Protestant Clergy*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Steigmann-Gall, Richard. "Old Wine in New Bottles," *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust*, ed. Kevin P. Spicer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- *The Holy Reich: Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919-1945*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge

- University Press, 2003.
- Stein, Leon. *The Racial Thinking of Richard Wagner*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950.
- Steinweis, Alan E. *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Stern, Fritz. *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- Stow, Kenneth. *Jewish Dogs, An Image and Its Interpreters: Continuity in the Catholic-Jewish Encounter*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555-1593*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1977.
- Tal, Uriel. "Aspects of Consecration of Politics in the Nazi Era," *Judaism And Christianity Under the Impact Of National Socialism*, Otto Dov Kulka and Paul R. Mendes-Flohr, Ed. Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel and The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1987.
- *Christians and Jews in Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870-1914*, Trans. Noah Jonathan Jacobs. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Taylor, Miram. *AntiJudaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*. New York: E.J.Brill, 1995.
- Teter, Magda. *Jews and Heretics in Catholic Poland: A Beleaguered Church in the Post-Reformation Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Toury, Jacob. "The Jewish Question: A Semantic Approach," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XI* (1966).
- Tractenberg, Joshua. *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Antisemitism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.
- Trevett, Christine. *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1992.
- Veyne, Paul. *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths?* Chicago, University of Chicago, 1988.
- Volkov, Shulamit. "Antisemitism as a Cultural Code: Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany." *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXII* (1978).

- Wasserstein, Abraham and David J. *The Legend of the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Webster, Ronald. "Opposing 'Victor's Justice': German Protestant Churchmen and Convicted War Criminals in Western Europe after 1945," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, V15, N1 (Spring 2001), 47-69,
- Wegner, Bernd. *The Waffen-SS: Organization, Ideology and Function*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Weinreich, Max. *Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People*. New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, 1946.
- Weiss, John. *Ideology of Death: Why the Holocaust Happened in Germany*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996.
- Wendehorst, Stephen, ed. *The Roman Inquisition, the Index, and the Jews: Contents, Sources, and Perspectives*. New York: Brill, 2004.
- Wilken, Robert L. *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983..
- ___ *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Willis, Robert E. "Bonhoeffer and Barth on Jewish Suffering: Reflections on the Relationship Between Theology and Moral Sensibility," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 24:4 (Fall 1987), 598-615.
- Wilson, Nelly. *Bernard Lazare, Antisemitism and the Problem of Jewish Identity in Late Nineteenth Century France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Wistrich, Robert S. *Antisemitism, the Longest Hatred*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1991.
- Wolf, Hubert. "The Good Friday Supplication for the Jews and the Roman Curia, 1928-1975, A Case Example for Research Prospects for the Twentieth Century," 235-257, *The Roman Inquisition, the Index, and the Jews*, Stephan Wendehorst, Ed. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Wolfson, Harry A. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Wynot, Edward D. Jr. "'A Necessary Cruelty': The Emergence of Official Anti-Semitism in Poland, 1936-1939," *The American Historical Review*, Vol.76, No. 4 (Oct.1971), 1035-1058.
- Yahil, Leni. *The Holocaust: The Fate of European Jewry*, translated by Ina Friedman and Haya Galai. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Zimmerman, Moshe. *Wilhelm Marr: The Patriarch of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Oxford

University Press, 1986.

— "Two Generations in the History of German Antisemitism: The Letters of Theodor Fritsch to Wilhelm Marr," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* XXII (1978)